arXiv:1209.6601v1 [math.PR] 28 Sep 2012

Optimal Stopping under Nonlinear Expectation

Ibrahim Ekren* Nizar Touzi† Jianfeng Zhang‡

October 1, 2012

Abstract

Let X be a bounded càdlàg process with positive jumps defined on the canonical space of continuous paths. We consider the problem of optimal stopping the process X under a nonlinear expectation operator $\mathcal{E}$ defined as the supremum of expectations over a weakly compact family of nondominated measures. We introduce the corresponding nonlinear Snell envelope. Our main objective is to extend the Snell envelope characterization to the present context. Namely, we prove that the nonlinear Snell envelope is an $\mathcal{E}-$supermartingale, and an $\mathcal{E}-$martingale up to its first hitting time of the obstacle X. This result is obtained under an additional uniform continuity property of X. We also extend the result in the context of a random horizon optimal stopping problem.

This result is crucial for the newly developed theory of viscosity solutions of path-dependent PDEs as introduced in [5], in the semilinear case, and extended to the fully nonlinear case in the accompanying papers [6, 7].

Key words: Nonlinear expectation, optimal stopping.

AMS 2000 subject classifications: 35D40, 35K10, 60H10, 60H30.

---

[*] University of Southern California, Department of Mathematics, ekren@usc.edu.

[†] CMAP, Ecole Polytechnique Paris, nizar.touzi@polytechnique.edu. Research supported by the Chair *Financial Risks* of the *Risk Foundation* sponsored by Société Générale, and the Chair *Finance and Sustainable Development* sponsored by EDF and Calyon.

[‡] University of Southern California, Department of Mathematics, jianfenz@usc.edu. Research supported in part by NSF grant DMS 10-08873.

1 Introduction

On the canonical space of continuous paths, we consider a bounded càdlàg process X, with positive jumps, and satisfying some uniform continuity condition. Let H_0 be the first exit time of the canonical process from some convex domain, and $\mathrm{H} := \mathrm{H}_0 \wedge t_0$ for some $t_0 > 0$. This paper focuses on the problem

$$\sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \mathcal{E}[X_{\tau \wedge \mathrm{H}}], \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{E}[.] := \sup_{\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[.],$$

$\mathcal{T}$ is the collection of all stopping times, relative to the natural filtration of the canonical process, and $\mathcal{P}$ is a weakly compact non-dominated family of singular measures.

Our main result is the following. Similar to the standard theory of optimal stopping, we introduce the corresponding nonlinear Snell envelope, and we show that the classical Snell envelope characterization holds true in the present context. More precisely, we prove that the Snell envelope is an $\mathcal{E}-$supermartingale, and an $\mathcal{E}-$martingale up to its first hitting time τ^* of the obstacte. Consequently, τ^* is an optimal stopping time for our problem of optimal stopping under nonlinear expectation.

This result is proved by adapting the classical arguments available in the context of the standard optimal stopping problem under linear expectation. However, such an extension turns out to be highly technical. The first step is to derive the dynamic programming principle in the present context, implying the $\mathcal{E}-$supermartingale property. To establish the $\mathcal{E}-$martingale property on $[0, \tau^*]$, we need to use some limiting argument. However, we face one major difficulty related to the fact that the convergence theorems under nonlinear expectation require some regularity of the sequence of random variables. This was observed in Denis, Hu and Peng [3]. Therefore, one main contribution of this paper is to construct convenient quasi-continuous approximations of the sequences of interest.

We note that in an one dimensional Markov model with uniformly non-degenerate diffusion, Krylov [10] studied a similar optimal stopping problem in the language of stochastic control (instead of nonlinear expectation). However, his approach relies heavily on the smoothness of the (deterministic) value function, which we do not have here. Indeed, one of the main technical difficulties in our situation is to obtain the locally uniform regularity of the value process.

Our interest in this problem is motivated from the recent notion of viscosity solutions of path-dependent partial differential equations, as developed in [5] and the accompanying papers [6, 7]. Our definition is in the spirit of Crandal, Ishii and Lions [2], see also Fleming and Soner [9], but avoids the difficulties related to the fact that our canonical space fails to be locally compact. The key point is that the pointwise maximality condition, in the standard theory of viscosity solution, is replaced by a problem of optimal stopping under nonlinear expectation.

Our previous paper [5] was restricted to the context of semilinear path-dependent partial differential equations. In this special case, our definition of viscosity solutions can be restricted to the context where $\mathcal{P}$ consists of absolutely continuous measures on the canonical space. Consequently, the Snell envelope characterization of the optimal stopping problem under nonlinear expectation is available in the existing literature on reflected backward stochastic differential equations, see e.g. El Karoui et al [8], Bayraktar, Karatzas and Yao [1]. However, the extension of our definition to the fully nonlinear case requires to consider a nondominated family of singular measures.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the probabilistic framework. Section 3 formulates the problem of optimal stopping under nonlinear expectation, and contains the statement of our main results. The proof of the Snell envelope characterization in the deterministic maturity case is reported in Section 4. The more involved case of a random maturity is addressed in Section 5.

2 Nondominated family of measures on the canonical space

2.1 The canonical spaces

Let $\Omega := \big\{\omega \in C([0,T],\mathbb{R}^d) : \omega_0 = \mathbf{0}\big\}$, the set of continuous paths starting from the origin, B the canonical process, $\mathbb{F}$ the filtration generated by B, $\mathbb{P}_0$ the Wiener measure, $\mathcal{T}$ denote the set of $\mathbb{F}$-stopping times, and $\Lambda := [0,T] \times \Omega$. Here and in the sequel, for notational simplicity, we use $\mathbf{0}$ to denote vectors or matrices with appropriate dimensions whose components are all equal to 0. We define a norm on Ω and a metric on Λ as follows: for any $(t,\omega),(t',\omega') \in \Lambda$,

$$\|\omega\|_t := \sup_{0\le s\le t} |\omega_s|, \quad \mathbf{d}_\infty\big((t,\omega),(t',\omega')\big) := |t-t'| + \big\|\omega_{.\wedge t} - \omega'_{.\wedge t'}\big\|_T. \tag{2.1}$$

Then $(\Omega, \|\cdot\|_T)$ and $(\Lambda, \mathbf{d}_\infty)$ are complete metric spaces.

We next introduce the shifted spaces. Let $0 \le s \le t \le T$.

- Let $\Omega^t := \big\{\omega \in C([t,T],\mathbb{R}^d) : \omega_t = \mathbf{0}\big\}$ be the shifted canonical space; B^t the shifted canonical process on Ω^t; $\mathbb{F}^t$ the shifted filtration generated by B^t, $\mathbb{P}^t_0$ the Wiener measure on Ω^t, $\mathcal{T}^t$ denote the set of $\mathbb{F}^t$-stopping times, and $\Lambda^t := [t,T] \times \Omega^t$.

- For $\omega \in \Omega^s$ and $\omega' \in \Omega^t$, define the concatenation path $\omega \otimes_t \omega' \in \Omega^s$ by:

$$(\omega \otimes_t \omega')(r) := \omega_r \mathbf{1}_{[s,t)}(r) + (\omega_t + \hat{\omega}'_r)\mathbf{1}_{[t,T]}(r), \quad \text{for all} \quad r \in [s,T].$$

- Let $s \in [0,T)$ and $\omega \in \Omega^s$. For an $\mathcal{F}^s_T$-measurable random variable ξ, an $\mathbb{F}^s$-progressively measurable process X on Ω^s, and $t \in (s,T]$, define the shifted $\mathcal{F}^t_T$-measurable random variable $\xi^{t,\omega}$ and $\mathbb{F}^t$-progressively measurable process $X^{t,\omega}$ on Ω^t by:

$$\xi^{t,\omega}(\omega') := \xi(\omega \otimes_t \omega'), \quad X^{t,\omega}(\omega') := X(\omega \otimes_t \omega'), \quad \text{for all} \quad \omega' \in \Omega^t.$$

2.2 Capacity and nonlinear expectation

A probability measure $\mathbb{P}$ on Ω^t is called a semimartingale measure if the canonical process B^t is a semimartingale under $\mathbb{P}$. For every constant $L > 0$, we denote by $\mathcal{P}^L_t$ the collection of all semimartingale measures $\mathbb{P}$ on Ω^t such that there exist $\mathbb{F}^t$-progressively measurable $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued process $\alpha^{\mathbb{P}}$, a process $\beta^{\mathbb{P}} \geq \mathbf{0}$ with $d\times d$-symmetric matrix values, and a d-dimensional $\mathbb{P}$-Brownian motion $W^{\mathbb{P}}$ satisfying:

$$dB_t = \beta^{\mathbb{P}}_t dW^{\mathbb{P}}_t + \alpha^{\mathbb{P}}_t dt, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s. and} \quad |\alpha| \leq L, \quad |\beta| \leq \sqrt{2L}. \tag{2.2}$$

Throughout this paper, we shall consider a family $\{\mathcal{P}_t, t \in [0,T]\}$ of semimartingale measures on Ω^t satisfying:

(P1) *there exists some L_0 such that, for all t, $\mathcal{P}_t$ is a weakly compact subset of $\mathcal{P}^{L_0}_t$.*

(P2) *For any $0 \leq t \leq T$, $\tau \in \mathcal{T}^t$, and $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_t$, the r.c.p.d. $\mathbb{P}^{\tau,\omega} \in \mathcal{P}_{\tau(\omega)}$ for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega^t$.*

(P3) *For any $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$, $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_s$, $\{E_i, i \geq 1\} \subset \mathcal{F}^s_t$ disjoint, and $\mathbb{P}^i \in \mathcal{P}_t$, the following $\hat{\mathbb{P}}$ is also in $\mathcal{P}_s$:*

$$\hat{\mathbb{P}} \quad := \quad \mathbb{P} \otimes_t \Big[\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}^i \mathbf{1}_{E_i} + \mathbb{P}\mathbf{1}_{\cap_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i^c}\Big]. \tag{2.3}$$

Here (2.3) means, for any event $E \in \mathcal{F}^s_T$ and denoting $E^{t,\omega} := \{\omega' \in \Omega^t : \omega \otimes_t \omega' \in E\}$:

$$\hat{\mathbb{P}}[E] := \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}^i[E^{t,\omega}]\mathbf{1}_{E_i}(\omega)\Big] + \mathbb{P}\big[E \cap (\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i)^c\big].$$

We refer to the seminal work of Stroock and Varadhan [18] for the introduction of r.c.p.d., which is a convenient tool for proving the dynamic programming principles, see e.g. Peng [12] and Soner, Touzi, and Zhang [15].

We observe that for all $L > 0$, the family $\{\mathcal{P}^L_t, t \in [0,T]\}$ satisfies conditions (P1-P2-P3). In particular, the weak compactness follows standard arguments, see e.g. Zheng [19] Theorem 3. The following are some other typical examples of such a family $\{\mathcal{P}_t, t \in [0,T]\}$.

Example 2.1 Let $L, L_1, L_2 > 0$ be some constants.
Wiener measure $\mathcal{P}_t^0 := \{\mathbb{P}_0^t\} = \{\mathbb{P} : \alpha^{\mathbb{P}} = 0, \beta^{\mathbb{P}} = I_d\}$.
Finite variation $\mathcal{P}_t^{\mathrm{FV}}(L) := \{\mathbb{P} : |\alpha^{\mathbb{P}}| \le L, \beta^{\mathbb{P}} = \mathbf{0}\}$.
Drifted Wiener measure $\mathcal{P}_t^{0,\mathrm{ac}}(L) := \{\mathbb{P} : |\alpha^{\mathbb{P}}| \le L, \beta^{\mathbb{P}} = I_d\}$.
Relaxed bounds $\mathcal{P}_t(L_1, L_2) := \{\mathbb{P} : |\alpha^{\mathbb{P}}| \le L_1, \mathbf{0} \le \beta^{\mathbb{P}} \le L_2 I_d\}$.
Relaxed bounds, Uniformly elliptic $\mathcal{P}_t^{\mathrm{UE}}(L_1, L_2, L) := \{\mathbb{P} : |\alpha^{\mathbb{P}}| \le L_1, L I_d \le \beta^{\mathbb{P}} \le L_2 I_d\}$.
Equivalent martingale measures $\mathcal{P}_t^{\mathrm{e}}(L_1, L_2, L) := \{\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_t(L_1, L_2) \colon \exists\, |\gamma^{\mathbb{P}}| \le L, \alpha^{\mathbb{P}} = \beta^{\mathbb{P}} \gamma^{\mathbb{P}}\}$.

We denote by $\mathbb{L}^1(\mathcal{F}_T^t, \mathcal{P}_t)$ the set of all $\mathcal{F}_T^t-$measurable r.v. ξ with $\sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}_t} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[|\xi|] < \infty$. The set $\mathcal{P}_t$ induces the following capacity and nonlinear expectation:

$$\mathcal{C}_t[A] := \sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}_t} \mathbb{P}[A] \text{ for } A \in \mathcal{F}_T^t, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}_t[\xi] = \sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}_t} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[\xi] \text{ for } \xi \in \mathbb{L}^1(\mathcal{F}_T^t, \mathcal{P}_t). \tag{2.4}$$

When $t = 0$, we shall omit t and abbreviate them as $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}$. Clearly $\mathcal{E}$ is a G-expectation, in the sense of Peng [13]. We remark that, when ξ satisfies certain regularity condition, then $\mathcal{E}_t[\xi^{t,\omega}]$ can be viewed as the conditional G-expectation of ξ, and as a process it is the solution of a Second Order BSDEs, as introduced by Soner, Touzi and Zhang [16].

Abusing the terminology of Denis and Martini [4], we say that a property holds $\mathcal{P}$-q.s. (quasi-surely) if it holds $\mathbb{P}-$a.s. for all $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$, and a random variable $\xi : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is $\mathcal{P}$-quasicontinuous if for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a closed set $\Omega_\varepsilon \subset \Omega$ such that $\mathcal{C}(\Omega_\varepsilon^c) < \varepsilon$ and ξ is continuous in Ω_ε. By Denis, Hu and Peng [3] Lemma 4 and Theorem 28, we have

Proposition 2.2 (i) *Let $(\Omega_n)_{n\ge1}$ be a sequence of open sets with $\Omega_n \uparrow \Omega$. Then $\mathcal{C}(\Omega_n^c) \downarrow 0$.*
(ii) *Let $(\xi_n)_{n\ge1}$ be a sequence of $\mathcal{P}$-quasicontinuous maps from Ω to $\mathbb{R}$. If $\xi_n \downarrow \xi$, $\mathcal{P}$-q.s. then $\mathcal{E}[\xi_n] \downarrow \mathcal{E}[\xi]$.*

We finally recall the notion of martingales under nonlinear expectation.

Definition 2.3 *Let X be an $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable process with $X_\tau \in \mathbb{L}^1(\mathcal{F}_\tau, \mathcal{P})$ for all $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$. We say that X is a $\mathcal{E}-$supermartingale (resp. submartingale, martingale) if, for any $(t,\omega) \in \Lambda$ and any $\tau \in \mathcal{T}^t$, $\mathcal{E}_t[X_\tau^{t,\omega}] \le$ (resp. $\ge, =$) $X_t(\omega)$ for $\mathcal{P}$-q.s. $\omega \in \Omega$.*

We remark that we require the $\mathcal{E}$-supermartingale property holds for stopping times. Under linear expectation $\mathbb{P}$, this is equivalent to the $\mathbb{P}$-supermartingale property for deterministic times, due to the Doob's optional sampling theorem. However, under nonlinear expectation, they are in general not equivalent.

3 Optimal stopping under nonlinear expectations

We now fix an $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable process X.

Assumption 3.1 *X is a bounded càdlàg process with positive jumps, and there exists a modulus of continuity function ρ_0 such that for any $(t,\omega),(t',\omega')\in\Lambda$:*

$$X(t,\omega)-X(t',\omega')\le\rho_0\Big(\mathbf{d}_\infty\big((t,\omega),(t',\omega')\big)\Big)\ \textit{whenever}\ t\le t'. \tag{3.1}$$

Remark 3.2 The above assumption is somehow redundant. Indeed, it is shown at the end of this section that *Condition* (3.1) *implies that X has left-limits and $X_{t-}\le X_t$ for all $t\in(0,T]$.*

We define the nonlinear Snell envelope and the corresponding obstacle first hitting time:

$$Y_t(\omega):=\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}^t}\mathcal{E}_t[X^{t,\omega}_\tau],\quad\text{and}\quad\tau^*:=\inf\{t\ge0:Y_t=X_t\}. \tag{3.2}$$

Our first result is the following *nonlinear Snell envelope* characterization of the deterministic maturity optimal stopping problem Y_0.

Theorem 3.3 (Deterministic maturity) *Let X be satisfying Assumption 3.1. Then Y is an $\mathcal{E}$-supermartingale on $[0,T]$, $Y_{\tau^*}=X_{\tau^*}$, and $Y_{.\wedge\tau^*}$ is an $\mathcal{E}$-martingale. Consequently, τ^* is an optimal stopping time for the problem Y_0.*

To prove the partial comparison principle for viscosity solutions of path-dependent partial differential equations in our accompanying paper [7], we need to consider optimal stopping problems with random maturity time $\textsc{h}\in\mathcal{T}$ of the form

$$\textsc{h}:=\inf\{t\ge0:B_t\in O^c\}\wedge t_0, \tag{3.3}$$

for some $t_0\in(0,T]$ and some open convex set $O\subset\mathbb{R}^d$ containing the origin. We shall extend the previous result to the following stopped process:

$$\widehat{X}^{\textsc{h}}_s:=X_s\mathbf{1}_{\{s<\textsc{h}\}}+X_{\textsc{h}-}\mathbf{1}_{\{s\ge\textsc{h}\}}\quad\text{for}\quad s\in[0,T]. \tag{3.4}$$

The corresponding Snelle envelope and obstacle first hitting time are denoted:

$$\widehat{Y}^{\textsc{h}}_t(\omega):=\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}^t}\mathcal{E}_t\Big[\widehat{X}^{t,\omega}_\tau\Big],\quad\text{and}\quad\widehat{\tau}^*:=\inf\{t\ge0:\widehat{Y}^{\textsc{h}}_t=\widehat{X}^{\textsc{h}}_t\}. \tag{3.5}$$

Our second main result requires the following additional assumption.

Assumption 3.4 (i) *For some* $L > 0$, $\mathcal{P}_t^{\rm FV}(L) \subset \mathcal{P}_t$ *for all* $t \in [0,T]$, *where* $\mathcal{P}_t^{\rm FV}(L)$ *is defined in Example 2.1.*
(ii) *For any* $0 \le t < t+\delta \le T$, $\mathcal{P}_t \subset \mathcal{P}_{t+\delta}$ *in the following sense: for any* $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_t$ *we have* $\tilde{\mathbb{P}} \in \mathcal{P}_{t+\delta}$, *where* $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ *is the probability measure on* $\Omega^{t+\delta}$ *such that the* $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$*-distribution of* $B^{t+\delta}$ *is equal to the* $\mathbb{P}$*-distribution of* $\{B_s^t, t \le s \le T-\delta\}$.

Theorem 3.5 (Random maturity) *Let* X *be a process satisfying Assumption 3.1, and suppose that the nondominated family of singular measures satisfies Assumption 3.4. Then* $\widehat{Y}^{\rm H}$ *is an* $\mathcal{E}$*-supermartingale on* $[0,{\rm H}]$, $\widehat{Y}^{\rm H}_{\widehat{\tau}^*} = \widehat{X}^{\rm H}_{\widehat{\tau}^*}$, *and* $\widehat{Y}^{\rm H}_{\cdot\wedge\widehat{\tau}^*}$ *is an* $\mathcal{E}$*-martingale. In particular,* $\widehat{\tau}^*$ *is an optimal stopping time.*

Remark 3.6 (i) The main difficulty for proving Theorem 3.5 is that stopping times are not continuous in ω, and thus we cannot apply the monotone convergence theorem, Proposition 2.2, directly on them. The requirement that the random maturity ${\rm H}$ is of the form (3.3) is crucial in order to construct a quasicontinuous approximation of $\widehat{\tau}^*$. We remark that, in his Markov model, Krylov [10] also considers this type of hitting times. We also remark that, in a special case, Song [17] proved that ${\rm H}$ is quasicontinuous.
(ii) Assumption 3.4 is a technical condition used to prove the dynamic programming principle in Subsection 5.1 below. By a little more involved arguments, we may prove the results by replacing Assumption 3.4 (i) with

$$\text{for some constant } L, L_1, L_2,\quad \mathcal{P}_t^{\rm UE}(L_1,L_2,L) \subset \mathcal{P}_t \quad \text{for all} \quad t \in [0,T],$$

where $\mathcal{P}_t^{\rm UE}$ is defined in Example 2.1 (iv). ■

We conclude this section with the

Proof of Remark 3.2 Fix $\omega \in \Omega$, and let $\{t_n\}$ and $\{s_n\}$ be two sequences such that $t_n \uparrow t, s_n \uparrow t$, and $X_{t_n} \longrightarrow \overline{\lim}_{s\uparrow t} X_s$, $X_{s_n} \longrightarrow \underline{\lim}_{s\uparrow t} X_s$. Here and in the sequel, in $\lim_{s\uparrow t}$ we take the notational convention that $s < t$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $t_n < s_n < t_{n+1}$ for $n = 1, 2, ...$ Then for the ρ_0 defined in (3.1) we have

$$0 \le \overline{\lim_{s\uparrow t}} X_s - \underline{\lim}_{s\uparrow t} X_s = \lim_{n\to\infty} X_{t_n} - \lim_{n\to\infty} X_{s_n} \le \underline{\lim}_{n\to\infty} \rho_0\Big(\mathbf{d}_\infty\big((t_n,\omega),(s_n,\omega)\big)\Big) = 0.$$

This implies the existence of $X_{t-}(\omega)$. Moreover,

$$X_{t-} - X_t = \lim_{s\uparrow t} X_s - X_t \le \underline{\lim}_{s\uparrow t} \rho\Big(\mathbf{d}_\infty\big((s,\omega),(t,\omega)\big)\Big) = 0,$$

completing the proof. ■

4 Deterministic maturity optimal stopping

We now prove Theorem 3.3. Throughout this section, Assumption 3.1 is always in force, and we consider the nonlinear Snell envelope Y together with the first obstacle hitting time τ^*, as defined in (3.2). Assume $|X| \leq C_0$, and without loss of generality that $\rho_0 \leq 2C_0$. It is obvious that

$$|Y| \leq C_0,\ Y \geq X, \text{ and } Y_T = X_T. \tag{4.1}$$

Throughout this section, we shall use the following modulus of continuity functions:

$$\bar{\rho}_0(\delta) := \rho_0(\delta) \vee \Big[\rho_0(\delta^{\frac{1}{3}}) + \delta^{\frac{1}{3}}\Big], \tag{4.2}$$

and we shall use a generic constant C which depends only on C_0, T, d, and the L_0 in Property (P1), and it may vary from line to line.

4.1 Dynamic Programming Principle

Similar to the standard Snell envelope characterization under linear expectation, our first step is to establish the dynamic programming principle. We start by the case of determinsitic times.

Lemma 4.1 *The process Y is uniformly continuous in ω, with the modulus of continuity function ρ_0, and satisfies*

$$Y_{t_1}(\omega) = \sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}^{t_1}} \mathcal{E}_{t_1}\Big[X^{t_1,\omega}_\tau \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<t_2\}} + Y^{t_1,\omega}_{t_2}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau\ \geq t_2\}}\Big] \quad \text{for all} \quad 0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq T, \omega\in\Omega. \tag{4.3}$$

Proof (i) First, for any t, any $\omega,\omega'\in\Omega$, and any $\tau\in\mathcal{T}^t$, by (3.1) we have

$$\begin{aligned} |X^{t,\omega}_\tau - X^{t,\omega'}_\tau| &= \Big|X(\tau(B^t),\omega\otimes_t B^t) - X(\tau(B^t),\omega'\otimes_t B^t)\Big| \\ &\leq \rho_0\Big(\mathbf{d}_\infty\big((\tau(B^t),\omega\otimes_t B^t),(\tau(B^t),\omega'\otimes_t B^t)\big)\Big) = \rho_0\big(\|\omega-\omega'\|_t\big). \end{aligned}$$

Since τ is arbitrary, this proves uniform continuity of Y in ω.
(ii) When $t_2 = T$, since $Y_T = X_T$ (4.3) coincides with the definition of Y. Without loss of generality we assume $(t_1,\omega) = (0,\mathbf{0})$ and $t := t_2 < T$.
Step 1. We first prove "$\leq$". For any $\tau\in\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}$:

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[X_\tau] = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[X_\tau\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<t\}} + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}_t[X_\tau]\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau\geq t\}}\Big]$$

By the definition of the r.c.p.d., we have $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}_t[X_\tau](\omega) = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{t,\omega}}[X^{t,\omega}_{\tau^{t,\omega}}] \le Y_t(\omega)$ for $\mathbb{P}-$a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$, where the inequality follows from Property (P2) of the family $\{\mathcal{P}_t\}$ that $\mathbb{P}^{t,\omega} \in \mathcal{P}_t$. Then:

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[X_\tau\right] \quad \le \quad \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[X_\tau \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<t\}} + Y_t \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau\ge t\}}\right].$$

By taking the sup over τ and $\mathbb{P}$, it follows that:

$$Y_0 \quad = \quad \sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{E}[X_\tau] \;\le\; \sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{E}\big[X_\tau \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<t\}} + Y_t \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau\ge t\}}\big].$$

Step 2. We next prove "$\ge$". Fix arbitrary $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ and $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$, we shall prove

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\big[X_\tau \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<t\}} + Y_t \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau\ge t\}}\big] \quad \le \quad Y_0. \tag{4.4}$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$, and $\{E_i\}_{i\ge1}$ be an $\mathcal{F}_t$-measurable partition of the event $\{\tau \ge t\} \in \mathcal{F}_t$ such that $\|\omega - \tilde\omega\| \le \varepsilon$ for all $\omega, \tilde\omega \in E_i$. For each i, fix an $\omega^i \in E_i$, and by the definition of Y we have

$$Y_t(\omega^i) \;\le\; \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^i}\big[X^{t,\omega^i}_{\tau^i}\big] + \varepsilon \quad \text{for some} \quad (\tau^i, \mathbb{P}^i) \in \mathcal{T}^t \times \mathcal{P}_t.$$

By (3.1) and the uniform continuity of Y, proved in (i), we have

$$|Y_t(\omega) - Y_t(\omega^i)| \le \rho_0(\varepsilon), \quad |X^{t,\omega}_{\tau^i} - X^{t,\omega^i}_{\tau^i}| \le \rho_0(\varepsilon), \quad \text{for all} \quad \omega \in E_i.$$

Thus, for $\omega \in E_i$,

$$Y_t(\omega) \le Y_t(\omega^i) + \rho_0(\varepsilon) \le \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^i}\big[X^{t,\omega^i}_{\tau^i}\big] + \varepsilon + \rho_0(\varepsilon) \le \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^i}\big[X^{t,\omega}_{\tau^i}\big] + \varepsilon + 2\rho_0(\varepsilon). \tag{4.5}$$

Thanks to Property (P3) of the family $\{\mathcal{P}_t\}$, we may define the following pair $(\tilde\tau, \tilde{\mathbb{P}}) \in \mathcal{T}\times\mathcal{P}$:

$$\tilde\tau := \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<t\}}\tau + \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau\ge t\}} \sum_{i\ge1} \mathbf{1}_{E_i} \tau^i(B^t); \qquad \tilde{\mathbb{P}} := \mathbb{P} \otimes_t \Big[\sum_{i\ge1} \mathbf{1}_{E_i}\mathbb{P}^i + \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<t\}}\mathbb{P}\Big].$$

It is obvious that $\{\tau < t\} = \{\tilde\tau < t\}$. Then, by (4.5),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\big[X_\tau \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<t\}} + Y_t \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau\ge t\}}\big] \quad &= \quad \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[X_\tau \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<t\}} + \sum_{i\ge1} Y_t \mathbf{1}_{E_i}\Big] \\
&\le \quad \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[X_\tau \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<t\}} + \sum_{i\ge1} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^i}[X^{t,\omega}_{\tau^i}]\mathbf{1}_{E_i}\Big] + \varepsilon + 2\rho_0(\varepsilon) \\
&= \quad \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\Big[X_{\tilde\tau} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde\tau<t\}} + \sum_{i\ge1} X_{\tilde\tau} \mathbf{1}_{E_i}\Big] + \varepsilon + 2\rho_0(\varepsilon) \\
&= \quad \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\big[X_{\tilde\tau}\big] + \varepsilon + 2\rho_0(\varepsilon) \le Y_0 + \varepsilon + 2\rho_0(\varepsilon),
\end{aligned}$$

which provides (4.4) by sending $\varepsilon \to 0$. ■

We now derive the regularity of Y in t.

Lemma 4.2 *For each* $\omega \in \Omega$ *and* $0 \le t_1 < t_2 \le T$,

$$|Y_{t_1}(\omega) - Y_{t_2}(\omega)| \le C\bar{\rho}_0\Big(\mathbf{d}_\infty\big((t_1,\omega),(t_2,\omega)\big)\Big).$$

Proof Denote $\delta := \mathbf{d}_\infty\big((t_1,\omega),(t_2,\omega)\big)$. If $\delta \ge \frac{1}{8}$, then clearly $|Y_{t_1}(\omega) - Y_{t_2}(\omega)| \le 2C_0 \le C\bar{\rho}_0(\delta)$. So we continue the proof assuming $\delta \le \frac{1}{8}$. First, by setting $\tau = t_2$ in Lemma 4.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta Y := Y_{t_2}(\omega) - Y_{t_1}(\omega) &\le Y_{t_2}(\omega) - \mathcal{E}_{t_1}\big[Y_{t_2}^{t_1,\omega}\big] \\
&\le \mathcal{E}_{t_1}\big[Y_{t_2}(\omega) - Y_{t_2}(\omega \otimes_{t_1} B^{t_1})\big] \\
&\le \mathcal{E}_{t_1}\big[\rho_0\big(\mathbf{d}_\infty\big((t_2,\omega),(t_2,\omega \otimes_{t_1} B^{t_1})\big)\big)\big] \\
&\le \mathcal{E}_{t_1}\big[\rho_0\big(\delta + \|B^{t_1}\|_{t_1+\delta}\big)\big].
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by the inequality $X \le Y$, Lemma 4.1, and (3.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
-\delta Y &\le \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^{t_1}} \mathcal{E}_{t_1}\Big[\big[X_{t_2}^{t_1,\omega} + \rho_0\big(\mathbf{d}_\infty((\tau,\omega \otimes_{t_1} B^{t_1}),(t_2,\omega \otimes_{t_1} B^{t_1}))\big)\big]\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<t_2\}} + Y_{t_2}^{t_1,\omega}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau \ge t_2\}}\Big] - Y_{t_2}(\omega) \\
&\le \mathcal{E}_{t_1}\Big[Y_{t_2}^{t_1,\omega} - Y_{t_2}(\omega) + \rho_0\big(\mathbf{d}_\infty((t_1,\omega),(t_2,\omega \otimes_{t_1} B^{t_1}))\big)\Big] \\
&\le \mathcal{E}_{t_1}\Big[\rho_0\big(\mathbf{d}_\infty((t_2,\omega),(t_2,\omega \otimes_{t_1} B^{t_1}))\big) + \rho_0\big(\mathbf{d}_\infty((t_1,\omega),(t_2,\omega \otimes_{t_1} B^{t_1}))\big)\Big] \\
&\le 2\mathcal{E}_{t_1}\big[\rho_0\big(\delta + \|B^{t_1}\|_{t_1+\delta}\big)\big].
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$|\delta Y| \;\le\; 2\mathcal{E}_{t_1}\big[\rho_0\big(\delta + \|B^{t_1}\|_{t_1+\delta}\big)\big] \;\le\; \mathcal{E}_{t_1}\Big[\rho_0\big(\delta + \frac{3}{4}\delta^{\frac{1}{3}}\big) + 2C_0\mathbf{1}_{\{\|B^{t_1}\|_{t_1+\delta} \ge \frac{3}{4}\delta^{\frac{1}{3}}\}}\Big].$$

Since $\delta + \frac{3}{4}\delta^{\frac{1}{3}} \le \delta^{\frac{1}{3}}$ for $\delta \le \frac{1}{8}$, this provides:

$$|\delta Y| \;\le\; \rho_0(\delta^{\frac{1}{3}}) + C\delta^{-\frac{2}{3}}\mathcal{E}_{t_1}\Big[\|B^{t_1}\|_{t_1+\delta}^2\Big] \;\le\; \rho_0(\delta^{\frac{1}{3}}) + C\delta^{-\frac{2}{3}}\delta \le C\bar{\rho}_0(\delta). \tag{4.6}$$

■

We are now ready to prove the dynamic programming principle for stopping times.

Theorem 4.3 *For any* $(t,\omega) \in \Lambda$ *and* $\tau \in \mathcal{T}^t$, *we have*

$$Y_t(\omega) = \sup_{\tilde{\tau} \in \mathcal{T}^t} \mathcal{E}_t\Big[X_{\tilde{\tau}}^{t,\omega}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{\tau}<\tau\}} + Y_\tau^{t,\omega}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{\tau} \ge \tau\}}\Big].$$

Consequently, Y *is an* $\mathcal{E}$*-supermartingale on* $[0,T]$.

Proof First, follow the arguments in Lemma 4.1 (ii) Step 1 and note that Property (P2) of the family $\{\mathcal{P}_t\}$ holds for stopping times, one can prove straightforwardly that

$$Y_t(\omega) \le \sup_{\tilde{\tau} \in \mathcal{T}^t} \mathcal{E}_t\Big[X_{\tilde{\tau}}^{t,\omega}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{\tau}<\tau\}} + Y_\tau^{t,\omega}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{\tau} \ge \tau\}}\Big].$$

On the other hand, let $\tau_k \downarrow \tau$ such that τ_k takes only finitely many values. By Lemma 4.1 one can easily show that Theorem 4.3 holds for τ_k. Then for any $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_t$ and $\tilde{\tau} \in \mathcal{T}^t$, by denoting $\tilde{\tau}_m := [\tilde{\tau} + \frac{1}{m}] \wedge T$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[X^{t,\omega}_{\tilde{\tau}_m}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{\tau}_m<\tau_k\}} + Y^{t,\omega}_{\tau_k}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{\tau}_m\geq\tau_k\}}\Big] \leq Y_t(\omega).$$

Sending $k \to \infty$, by Lemma 4.2 and the dominated convergence theorem (under $\mathbb{P}$):

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[X^{t,\omega}_{\tilde{\tau}_m}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{\tau}_m\leq\tau\}} + Y^{t,\omega}_{\tau}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{\tau}_m>\tau\}}\Big] \quad\leq\quad Y_t(\omega).$$

Sincethe process X is right continuous in t, we obtain by sending $m \to \infty$:

$$Y_t(\omega) \geq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[X^{t,\omega}_{\tilde{\tau}}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{\tau}<\tau\}} + Y^{t,\omega}_{\tau}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{\tau}\geq\tau\}}\Big],$$

which provides the required result by the arbitrariness of $\mathbb{P}$ and $\tilde{\tau}$. ■

4.2 Preparation for the $\mathcal{E}-$martingale property

If $Y_0 = X_0$, then $\tau^* = 0$ and obviously all the statements of Theorem 3.3 are true. Therefore, we focus on the non-trivial case $Y_0 > X_0$.

We continue following the proof of the Snell envelope characterization in the standard linear expectation context. Let

$$\tau_n := \inf\{t \geq 0 : Y_t - X_t \leq \frac{1}{n}\} \wedge T, \quad n > (Y_0 - X_0)^{-1} \quad . \tag{4.7}$$

Lemma 4.4 *The process Y is an $\mathcal{E}$-martingale on $[0, \tau_n]$.*

Proof By the dynamic programming principle of Theorem 4.3,

$$Y_0 \quad=\quad \sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{E}\Big[X_\tau\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<\tau_n\}} + Y_{\tau_n}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau\geq\tau_n\}}\Big].$$

For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist $\tau_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{T}$ and $\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{P}$ such that

$$Y_0 \;\leq\; \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon}\Big[X_{\tau_\varepsilon}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_\varepsilon<\tau_n\}} + Y_{\tau_n}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_\varepsilon\geq\tau_n\}}\Big] + \varepsilon \quad\leq\quad \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon}\Big[Y_{\tau_\varepsilon\wedge\tau_n} - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_\varepsilon<\tau_n\}}\Big] + \varepsilon, \tag{4.8}$$

where we used the fact that $Y_t - X_t > \frac{1}{n}$ for $t < \tau_n$, by the definition of τ_n. On the other hand, it follows from the $\mathcal{E}-$supermartingale property of Y in Theorem 4.3 that $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon}\Big[Y_{\tau_\varepsilon\wedge\tau_n}\Big] \leq \mathcal{E}[Y_{\tau_\varepsilon\wedge\tau_n}] \leq Y_0$, which implies by (4.8) that $\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon[\tau_\varepsilon < \tau_n] \leq n\varepsilon$. We then get from (4.8) that:

$$Y_0 \leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon}\Big[(X_{\tau_\varepsilon} - Y_{\tau_n})\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_\varepsilon<\tau_n\}} + Y_{\tau_n}\Big] + \varepsilon \leq C\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon[\tau_\varepsilon < \tau_n] + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon}[Y_{\tau_n}] + \varepsilon \leq \mathcal{E}[Y_{\tau_n}] + (Cn+1)\varepsilon.$$

Since ε is arbitrary, we obtain $Y_0 \le \mathcal{E}[Y_{\tau_n}]$. By the $\mathcal{E}-$supermartingale property of Y established in Theorem 4.3, this implies that Y is an $\mathcal{E}-$martingale on $[0, \tau_n]$. ■

By Lemma 4.2 we have

$$Y_0 - \mathcal{E}[Y_{\tau^*}] = \mathcal{E}[Y_{\tau_n}] - \mathcal{E}[Y_{\tau^*}] \le C\mathcal{E}\Big[\bar{\rho}_0\Big(\mathbf{d}_\infty\big((\tau_n,\omega),(\tau^*,\omega)\big)\Big)\Big]. \tag{4.9}$$

Clearly, $\tau_n \nearrow \tau^*$, and $\bar{\rho}_0\Big(\mathbf{d}_\infty\big((\tau_n,\omega),(\tau^*,\omega)\big)\Big) \searrow 0$. However, in general the stopping times τ_n, τ^* are not $\mathcal{P}$-quasicontinuous, so we cannot apply Proposition 2.2 (ii) to conclude $Y_0 \le \mathcal{E}[Y_{\tau^*}]$. To overcome this difficulty, we need to approximate τ_n by continuous r.v.

4.3 Continuous approximation

The following lemma can be viewed as a Lusin theorem under nonlinear expectation and is crucial for us.

Lemma 4.5 *Let $\underline{\theta} \le \theta \le \overline{\theta}$ be r.v. on Ω, with values in a compact interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, such that for some $\Omega_0 \subset \Omega$ and $\delta > 0$:*

$$\underline{\theta}(\omega) \le \theta(\omega') \le \overline{\theta}(\omega) \quad \text{for all} \quad \omega \in \Omega_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\omega - \omega'\| \le \delta.$$

Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a uniformly continuous function $\hat{\theta} : \Omega \to I$ and an open subset $\Omega_\varepsilon \subset \Omega$ such that

$$\mathcal{C}\big[\Omega_\varepsilon^c\big] \le \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{\theta} - \varepsilon \le \hat{\theta} \le \overline{\theta} + \varepsilon \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_\varepsilon \cap \Omega_0.$$

Proof If I is a single point set, then θ is a constant and the result is obviously true. Thus at below we assume the length $|I| > 0$. Let $\{\omega_j\}_{j\ge1}$ be a dense sequence in Ω. Denote $O_j := \{\omega \in \Omega : \|\omega - \omega_j\| < \frac{\delta}{2}\}$ and $\Omega_n := \cup_{j=1}^n O_j$. It is clear that Ω_n is open and $\Omega_n \uparrow \Omega$ as $n \to \infty$. Let $f_n : [0,\infty) \to [0,1]$ be defined as follows: $f_n(x) = 1$ for $x \in [0, \frac{\delta}{2}]$, $f_n(x) = \frac{1}{n^2|I|}$ for $x \ge \delta$, and f_n is linear in $[\frac{\delta}{2}, \delta]$. Define

$$\theta_n(\omega) := \phi_n(\omega)\sum_{j=1}^n \theta(\omega_j)\varphi_{n,j}(\omega) \text{ where } \varphi_{n,j}(\omega) := f_n(\|\omega - \omega_j\|) \text{ and } \phi_n := \Big(\sum_{j=1}^n \varphi_{n,j}\Big)^{-1}.$$

Then clearly θ_n is uniformly continuous and takes values in I. For each $\omega \in \Omega_n \cap \Omega_0$, the set $J_n(\omega) := \{1 \le j \le n : \|\omega - \omega_j\| \le \delta\} \ne \emptyset$ and $\phi_n(\omega) \le 1$. Then, by our assumption,

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta_n(\omega) - \overline{\theta}(\omega) &= \phi_n(\omega)\Big(\sum_{j\in J_n(\omega)}[\theta(\omega_j) - \overline{\theta}(\omega)]\varphi_{n,j}(\omega) + \sum_{j\notin J_n(\omega)}[\theta(\omega_j) - \overline{\theta}(\omega)]\varphi_{n,j}(\omega)\Big)\\
&\le \phi_n(\omega)\sum_{j\notin J_n(\omega)}|I|\varphi_{n,j}(\omega) \le \phi_n(\omega)\sum_{j\notin J_n(\omega)}\frac{1}{n^2} \le \frac{1}{n}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly one can show that $\underline{\theta} - \frac{1}{n} \le \theta_n$ in $\Omega_n \cap \Omega_0$. Finally, since $\Omega_n \uparrow \Omega$ as $n \to \infty$, it follows from Proposition 2.2 (i) that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{C}[\Omega_n^c] = 0$. ■

4.4 Proof of Theorem 3.3

We proceed in two steps.

Step 1. For each n, let $\delta_n > 0$ be such that $3C\bar\rho_0(\delta_n) \le \frac{1}{n(n+1)}$ for the constant C in Lemma 4.2. Now for any ω and ω' such that $\|\omega - \omega'\|_T \le \delta_n$, by (3.1), the uniform continuity of Y in Lemma 4.1, and the fact that $\rho_0 \le \bar\rho_0$, we have

$$(Y - X)_{\tau_{n+1}(\omega)}(\omega') \le (Y - X)_{\tau_{n+1}(\omega)}(\omega) + 3C\bar\rho_0(\delta_n) \le \frac{1}{n+1} + \frac{1}{n(n+1)} = \frac{1}{n}.$$

Then $\tau_n(\omega') \le \tau_{n+1}(\omega)$. Since $3C\bar\rho_0(\delta_n) \le \frac{1}{n(n+1)} \le \frac{1}{n(n-1)}$, similarly we have $\tau_{n-1}(\omega) \le \tau_n(\omega')$. We may then apply Lemma 4.5 with $\underline{\theta} = \tau_{n-1}$, $\theta = \tau_n$, $\overline{\theta} = \tau_{n+1}$, and $\Omega_0 = \Omega$. Then, there exist an open set $\Omega_n \subset \Omega$ and a continuous r.v. $\tilde\tau_n$ valued in $[0, T]$ such that

$$\mathcal{C}\big[\Omega_n^c\big] \le 2^{-n} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_{n-1} - 2^{-n} \le \tilde\tau_n \le \tau_{n+1} + 2^{-n} \text{ in } \Omega_n.$$

Step 2. By Lemma 4.4, for each n large, there exists $\mathbb{P}_n \in \mathcal{P}$ such that

$$Y_0 = \mathcal{E}[Y_{\tau_n}] \le \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_n}[Y_{\tau_n}] + 2^{-n}.$$

By Property (P1), $\mathcal{P}$ is weakly compact. Then, there exists a subsequence $\{n_j\}$ and $\mathbb{P}^* \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\mathbb{P}_{n_j}$ converges weakly to $\mathbb{P}^*$. Now for any n large and any $n_j \ge n$, note that $\tau_{n_j} \ge \tau_n$. Since Y is an $\mathcal{E}$-supermartingale and thus a $\mathbb{P}_{n_j}$-supermartingale, we have

$$Y_0 - 2^{-n_j} \;\le\; \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{n_j}}\big[Y_{\tau_{n_j}}\big] \;\le\; \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{n_j}}\big[Y_{\tau_n}\big] \le \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{n_j}}\big[Y_{\tilde\tau_n}\big] + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{n_j}}\big[|Y_{\tilde\tau_n} - Y_{\tau_n}|\big]. \tag{4.10}$$

By the boundedness of Y in (4.1) and the uniform continuity of Y in Lemma 4.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |Y_{\tilde\tau_n} - Y_{\tau_n}| &\le C\bar\rho_0\Big(\mathbf{d}_\infty\big((\tilde\tau_n,\omega),(\tau_n,\omega)\big)\Big) \\ &\le C\bar\rho_0\Big(\mathbf{d}_\infty\big((\tilde\tau_n,\omega),(\tau_n,\omega)\big)\Big)\mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{n-1}\cap\Omega_{n+1}} + C\mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{n-1}^c\cup\Omega_{n+1}^c}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $\tilde\tau_{n-1} - 2^{1-n} \le \tau_n \le \tilde\tau_{n+1} + 2^{-1-n}$ on $\Omega_{n-1}\cap\Omega_{n+1}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |Y_{\tilde\tau_n} - Y_{\tau_n}| &\le C\bar\rho_0\Big(\mathbf{d}_\infty\big((\tilde\tau_n,\omega),(\tilde\tau_{n-1} - 2^{1-n},\omega)\big)\Big)\mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{n-1}\cap\Omega_{n+1}} \\ &\quad + C\bar\rho_0\Big(\mathbf{d}_\infty\big((\tilde\tau_n,\omega),(\tilde\tau_{n+1} + 2^{-1-n},\omega)\big)\Big)\mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{n-1}\cap\Omega_{n+1}} + C\mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{n-1}^c\cup\Omega_{n+1}^c} \\ &\le C\bar\rho_0\Big(\mathbf{d}_\infty\big((\tilde\tau_n,\omega),(\tilde\tau_{n-1} - 2^{1-n},\omega)\big)\Big) \\ &\quad + C\bar\rho_0\Big(\mathbf{d}_\infty\big((\tilde\tau_n,\omega),(\tilde\tau_{n+1} + 2^{-1-n},\omega)\big)\Big) + C\mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{n-1}^c\cup\Omega_{n+1}^c}. \end{aligned}$$

Then (4.10) together with the estimate $\mathcal{C}[\Omega_n^c] \le 2^{-n}$ lead to

$$\begin{aligned} Y_0 - 2^{-n_j} \quad \le \quad & \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{n_j}}\big[Y_{\tilde\tau_n}\big] + C\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{n_j}}\Big[\bar\rho_0\Big(\mathbf{d}_\infty\big((\tilde\tau_n,\omega),(\tilde\tau_{n-1} - 2^{1-n},\omega)\big)\Big)\Big] \\ & + C\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{n_j}}\Big[\bar\rho_0\Big(\mathbf{d}_\infty\big((\tilde\tau_n,\omega),(\tilde\tau_{n+1} + 2^{-1-n},\omega)\big)\Big)\Big] + C2^{-n}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that Y and $\tilde\tau_{n-1}, \tilde\tau_n, \tilde\tau_{n+1}$ are continuous. Send $j \to \infty$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Y_0 \quad \le \quad & \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^*}\big[Y_{\tilde\tau_n}\big] + C\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^*}\Big[\bar\rho_0\Big(\mathbf{d}_\infty\big((\tilde\tau_n,\omega),(\tilde\tau_{n-1} - 2^{1-n},\omega)\big)\Big)\Big] \\ & + C\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^*}\Big[\bar\rho_0\Big(\mathbf{d}_\infty\big((\tilde\tau_n,\omega),(\tilde\tau_{n+1} - 2^{-1-n},\omega)\big)\Big)\Big] + C2^{-n}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

Since $\sum_n \mathcal{C}\big[|\tilde\tau_n - \tau_n| \ge 2^{-n}\big] \le \sum_n 2^{-n} < \infty$ and $\tau_n \uparrow \tau^*$, we may use the Borel-Cantelli lemma in the capacity framework, see [3] Lemma 9, and conclude that $\tilde\tau_n \to \tau^*$, $\mathcal{P}$-q.s. In particular, $\tilde\tau_n \to \tau^*$, $\mathbb{P}^*$-a.s. Send $n \to \infty$ in (4.11) and apply the dominated convergence theorem under $\mathbb{P}^*$, we obtain

$$Y_0 \le \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^*}\big[Y_{\tau^*}\big] \le \mathcal{E}[Y_{\tau^*}].$$

By the $\mathcal{E}$-supermartingale property of Y established in Theorem 4.3, this implies that Y is an $\mathcal{E}$-martingale on $[0,\tau^*]$. ■

5 Random maturity optimal stopping

In this section, we prove Theorem 3.5. The main idea follows that of Theorem 3.3. However, since $\widehat{X}_{\mathrm{H}}$ is not continuous in ω, the estimates become much more involved.

Throughout this section, let X, H, O, t_0, $\widehat{X} := \widehat{X}^{\mathrm{H}}$, $\widehat{Y} := \widehat{Y}^{\mathrm{H}}$, and $\widehat{\tau}^*$ be as in Theorem 3.5. Assumptions 3.1 and 3.4 will always be in force. We shall emphasize when the additional Assumption 3.4 is needed, and we fix the constant L as in Assumption 3.4 (i). Assume $|X| \le C_0$, and without loss of generality that $\rho_0 \le 2C_0$ and $L \le 1$. It is clear that

$$|\widehat{Y}| \le C_0,\ \widehat{X} \le \widehat{Y},\ \text{and}\ \widehat{Y}_{\mathrm{H}} = \widehat{X}_{\mathrm{H}} = X_{\mathrm{H}-}. \tag{5.1}$$

By (3.1) and recalling Remark 3.2 that $X_{t_-} \le X_t$, one can check straightforwardly that,

$$\begin{gathered} \widehat{X}(t,\omega) - \widehat{X}(t',\omega') \le \rho_0\big(\mathbf{d}_\infty((t,\omega),(t',\omega'))\big) \text{ for } t \le t',\ t \le \mathrm{H}(\omega),\ t' \le \mathrm{H}(\omega') \\ \text{except the case } t' = \mathrm{H}(\omega') < t_0 \text{ and } t < \mathrm{H}(\omega). \end{gathered} \tag{5.2}$$

In particular,

$$\widehat{X}(t,\omega) - \widehat{X}(t',\omega) \le \rho_0\big(\mathbf{d}_\infty((t,\omega),(t',\omega))\big) \quad \text{whenever} \quad t \le t' \le \mathrm{H}(\omega). \tag{5.3}$$

Moreover, we define

$$\rho_1(\delta) := \rho_0(\delta) \vee \Big[\rho_0\big((L^{-1}\delta)^{\frac{1}{3}}\big) + \delta^{\frac{1}{3}}\Big], \quad \rho_2(\delta) := [\rho_1(\delta) + \delta] \vee [\rho_1(\delta^{\frac{1}{3}}) + \delta^{\frac{1}{3}}], \tag{5.4}$$

and in this section, the generic constant C may depend on L as well.

5.1 Dynamic programming principle

We start with the regularity in ω.

Lemma 5.1 *For any $t < \mathrm{H}(\omega) \wedge \mathrm{H}(\omega')$ we have:*

$$|\widehat{Y}_t(\omega) - \widehat{Y}_t(\omega')| \le C\rho_1\big(\|\omega - \omega'\|_t\big).$$

To motivate our proof, we first follow the arguments in Lemma 4.1 (i) and see why it does not work here. Indeed, note that

$$\widehat{Y}_t(\omega) - \widehat{Y}_t(\omega') \le \sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}^t} \sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}_t} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[\widehat{X}^{t,\omega}_{\tau\wedge\mathrm{H}^{t,\omega}} - \widehat{X}^{t,\omega'}_{\tau\wedge\mathrm{H}^{t,\omega'}}\Big].$$

Since we do not have $\mathrm{H}^{t,\omega} \le \mathrm{H}^{t,\omega'}$, we cannot apply (5.2) to obtain the required estimate.

Proof Let $\tau \in \mathcal{T}^t$ and $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_t$. Denote $\delta := \frac{1}{L}\|\omega - \omega'\|_t$, $t_\delta := [t+\delta] \wedge t_0$ and $\tilde{B}^{t_\delta}_s := B^t_{s+\delta} - B^t_{t_\delta}$ for $s \ge t$. Set $\tau'(B^t) := [\tau(\tilde{B}^{t_\delta}) + \delta] \wedge t_0$, then $\tau' \in \mathcal{T}^t$. Moreover, by Assumption 3.4 and Property (P3), we may choose $\mathbb{P}' \in \mathcal{P}_t$ defined as follows: $\alpha^{\mathbb{P}'} := \frac{1}{\delta}(\omega_t - \omega'_t)$, $\beta^{\mathbb{P}'} := \mathbf{0}$ on $[t, t_\delta]$, and the $\mathbb{P}'$-distribution of $\tilde{B}^{t_\delta}$ is equal to the $\mathbb{P}$-distribution of B^t. We claim that

$$I := \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[\widehat{X}^{t,\omega}_{\tau\wedge\mathrm{H}^{t,\omega}}] - \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}'}[\widehat{X}^{t,\omega'}_{\tau'\wedge\mathrm{H}^{t,\omega'}}] \quad \le \quad C\rho_1(L\delta), \tag{5.5}$$

Then $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[\widehat{X}^{t,\omega}_{\tau\wedge\mathrm{H}^{t,\omega}}] - \widehat{Y}_t(\omega') \le \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[\widehat{X}^{t,\omega}_{\tau\wedge\mathrm{H}^{t,\omega}}] - \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}'}[\widehat{X}^{t,\omega'}_{\tau'\wedge\mathrm{H}^{t,\omega'}}] \le C\rho_1(L\delta)$, and it follows from the arbitrariness of $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_t$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{T}^t$ that $\widehat{Y}_t(\omega) - \widehat{Y}_t(\omega') \le C\rho_1(L\delta)$. By exchanging the roles of ω and ω', we obtain the required estimate.

It remains to prove (5.5). Denote

$$\tilde{\omega}'_s \quad := \quad \omega'_s \mathbf{1}_{[0,t)}(s) + [\omega'_t + \alpha^{\mathbb{P}'}(s-t)]\mathbf{1}_{[t,T]}(s).$$

Since $t < \mathrm{H}(\omega) \wedge \mathrm{H}(\omega')$, we have $\omega_t, \omega'_t \in O$. By the convexity of O, this implies that $\tilde{\omega}'_s \in O$ for $s \in [t, t_\delta]$, and thus $\mathrm{H}^{t,\omega'}(B^t) = (\mathrm{H}^{t,\omega}(\tilde{B}^{t_\delta}) + \delta) \wedge t_0$, $\mathbb{P}'$–a.s. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}'}[\widehat{X}^{t,\omega'}_{\tau'\wedge\mathrm{H}^{t,\omega'}}] &= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}'}\Big[\widehat{X}\Big(\tau'(B^t) \wedge \mathrm{H}^{t,\omega'}(B^t), \omega' \otimes_t B^t\Big)\Big] \\
&= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}'}\Big[\widehat{X}\Big([\tau(\tilde{B}^{t_\delta}) + \delta] \wedge [\mathrm{H}^{t,\omega}(\tilde{B}^{t_\delta}) + \delta] \wedge t_0, \tilde{\omega}' \otimes_{t_\delta} \tilde{B}^{t_\delta}_{\cdot-\delta}\Big)\Big] \\
&= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[\widehat{X}\Big([\tau(B^t) + \delta] \wedge [\mathrm{H}^{t,\omega}(B^t) + \delta] \wedge t_0, \tilde{\omega}' \otimes_{t_\delta} B^t_{\cdot-\delta}\Big)\Big],
\end{aligned}$$

while

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[\widehat{X}^{t,\omega}_{\tau\wedge\textsc{h}^{t,\omega}}] \;=\; \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[\widehat{X}\Big(\tau(B^t)\wedge\textsc{h}^{t,\omega}(B^t), \omega\otimes_t B^t\Big)\Big].$$

In order to apply (5.2), we need to exclude the exceptional case there. In the case

$$\begin{aligned} t_0 \;&>\; [\tau(B^t)+\delta]\wedge[\textsc{h}^{t,\omega}(B^t)+\delta]\wedge t_0 \\ &=\; \textsc{h}^{t,\tilde{\omega}'}((\tilde{\omega}'\otimes_{t_\delta} B^t_{\cdot-\delta})^t) = \textsc{h}^{t,\omega'}((\tilde{\omega}'\otimes_{t_\delta} B^t_{\cdot-\delta})^t) = [\textsc{h}^{t,\omega}(B^t)+\delta]\wedge t_0, \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\textsc{h}^{t,\omega}(B^t)+\delta \le \tau(B^t)+\delta < t_0 \quad \text{and thus} \quad \textsc{h}^{t,\omega}(B^t) \le \tau(B^t) < t_0.$$

So $\tau(B^t)\wedge\textsc{h}^{t,\omega}(B^t) = \textsc{h}^{t,\omega}(B^t)$, which excludes the exceptional case in (5.2). Then it follows from (5.6) and (5.2) that

$$I \;\le\; \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[\rho_0\Big(\delta + \|(\omega\otimes_t B^t)_{\cdot\wedge\tau(B^t)\wedge\textsc{h}^{t,\omega}(B^t)} - (\tilde{\omega}'\otimes_{t_\delta} B^t_{\cdot-\delta})_{\cdot\wedge[\tau(B^t)+\delta]\wedge[\textsc{h}^{t,\omega}(B^t)+\delta]\wedge t_0}\|_{t_0}\Big)\Big].$$

Note that, denoting $\theta := \tau(B^t)\wedge\textsc{h}^{t,\omega}(B^t)$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(\omega\otimes_t B^t)_{\cdot\wedge\tau(B^t)\wedge\textsc{h}^{t,\omega}(B^t)} - (\tilde{\omega}'\otimes_{t_\delta} B^t_{\cdot-\delta})_{\cdot\wedge[\tau(B^t)+\delta]\wedge[\textsc{h}^{t,\omega}(B^t)+\delta]\wedge t_0}\|_{t_0} \\ \le\;& \|\omega\otimes_t B^t - \tilde{\omega}'\otimes_{t_\delta} B^t_{\cdot-\delta}\|_{t_0} + \sup_{0\le r\le\delta}|(\omega\otimes_t B^t)_{\theta+r} - (\omega\otimes_t B^t)_\theta| \\ \le\;& \Big[\|\omega-\omega'\|_t\Big]\vee\Big[\sup_{t\le s\le t_\delta}|\omega_t + B^t_s - \tilde{\omega}'_s|\Big]\vee\Big[\sup_{t_\delta\le s\le t_0}|\omega_t + B^t_s - \tilde{\omega}'_{t_\delta} - B^t_{s-\delta}|\Big] \\ &+\sup_{0\le r\le\delta}|(\omega\otimes_t B^t)_{\theta+r} - (\omega\otimes_t B^t)_\theta| \\ \le\;& 2L\delta + \|B^t\|_{t_\delta} + \sup_{t_\delta\le s\le t_0}|B^t_s - B^t_{s-\delta}| + \sup_{0\le r\le\delta}|B^t_{\theta+r} - B^t_\theta|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $L\le 1$, we have

$$I \;\le\; \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[\rho_0\Big(3\delta + \|B^t\|_{t_\delta} + \sup_{t_\delta\le s\le t_0}|B^t_s - B^t_{s-\delta}| + \sup_{0\le r\le\delta}|B^t_{\theta+r} - B^t_\theta|\Big)\Big].$$

If $\delta\ge\frac{1}{8}$, then $I\le 2C_0\le C\rho_1(L\delta)$. We then continue assuming $\delta\le\frac{1}{8}$, and thus $3\delta+\frac{1}{4}\delta^{\frac{1}{3}}\le\delta^{\frac{1}{3}}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} I \;&\le\; \rho_0(\delta^{\frac{1}{3}}) + C\mathbb{P}\Big(\|B^t\|_{t_\delta} + \sup_{t_\delta\le s\le t_0}|B^t_s - B^t_{s-\delta}| + \sup_{0\le r\le\delta}|B^t_{\theta+r} - B^t_\theta| \ge \frac{1}{2}\delta^{\frac{1}{3}}\Big) \\ &\le\; \rho_0(\delta^{\frac{1}{3}}) + C\delta^{-\frac{8}{3}}\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[\|B^t\|^8_{t_\delta} + \sup_{t_\delta\le s\le t_0}|B^t_s - B^t_{s-\delta}|^8 + \sup_{0\le r\le\delta}|B^t_{\theta+r} - B^t_\theta|^8\Big] \\ &\le\; \rho_0(\delta^{\frac{1}{3}}) + C\delta^{\frac{4}{3}} + C\delta^{-\frac{8}{3}}\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[\sup_{t_\delta\le s\le t_0}|B^t_s - B^t_{s-\delta}|^8\Big]. \end{aligned}$$

Set $t_\delta = s_0 < \cdots < s_n = t_0$ such that $\delta \le s_{i+1} - s_i \le 2\delta$, $i = 0, \cdots, n-1$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[\sup_{t_\delta \le s \le t_0} |B^t_s - B^t_{s-\delta}|^8\Big] = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[\max_{0\le i\le n-1}\sup_{s_i\le s\le s_{i+1}} |B^t_s - B^t_{s-\delta}|^8\Big]\\
\le\;& \sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[\sup_{s_i\le s\le s_{i+1}} [|B^t_s - B^t_{s_i-\delta}| + |B^t_{s-\delta} - B^t_{s_i-\delta}|]^8\Big]\\
\le\;& C\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}(s_{i+1} - s_i + \delta)^4 \le C\delta^{-1}\delta^4 = C\delta^3.
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus $I \le \rho_0(\delta^{\frac{1}{3}}) + C\delta^{\frac{4}{3}} + C\delta^{-\frac{8}{3}}\delta^3 \le \rho_0(\delta^{\frac{1}{3}}) + C\delta^{\frac{1}{3}} \le C\rho_1(L\delta)$, proving (5.5) and hence the lemma. ■

We next show that the dynamic programming principle holds along deterministic times.

Lemma 5.2 *Let $t_1 < \mathrm{H}(\omega)$ and $t_2 \in [t_1, t_0]$. We have:*

$$
\widehat{Y}_{t_1}(\omega) \;=\; \sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}^{t_1}} \mathcal{E}_{t_1}\Big[\widehat{X}^{t_1,\omega}_{\tau\wedge \mathrm{H}^{t_1,\omega}}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau\wedge \mathrm{H}^{t_1,\omega} < t_2\}} + \widehat{Y}^{t_1,\omega}_{t_2}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau\wedge \mathrm{H}^{t_1,\omega}\ge t_2\}}\Big].
$$

Proof When $t_2 = t_0$, the lemma coincides with the definition of $\widehat{Y}$. Without loss of generality we assume $(t_1,\omega) = (0,\mathbf{0})$ and $t := t_2 < t_0$. First, follow the arguments in Lemma 4.1 (ii) Step 1, one can easily prove

$$
\widehat{Y}_0 \;\le\; \sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{E}\Big[\widehat{X}_{\tau\wedge \mathrm{H}}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau\wedge \mathrm{H} < t\}} + \widehat{Y}_t\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau\wedge \mathrm{H}\ge t\}}\Big]. \tag{5.6}
$$

To show that equality holds in the above inequality, fix $\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}$, $\tau\in\mathcal{T}$, we shall prove

$$
\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[\widehat{X}_{\tau\wedge \mathrm{H}}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau\wedge \mathrm{H} < t\}} + \widehat{Y}_t\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau\wedge \mathrm{H}\ge t\}}\Big] \;\le\; \widehat{Y}_0.
$$

Since $\widehat{Y}_{\mathrm{H}} = \widehat{X}_{\mathrm{H}}$, this amounts to say:

$$
\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[\widehat{X}_{\tau\wedge \mathrm{H}}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < t\}\cup\{\mathrm{H}\le t\}} + \widehat{Y}_t\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau\ge t, \mathrm{H} > t\}}\Big] \;\le\; \widehat{Y}_0. \tag{5.7}
$$

We adapt the arguments in Lemma 4.1 (ii) Step 2 to the present situation. Fix $0 < \delta \le t_0 - t$. Let $\{E_i\}_{i\ge1}$ be an $\mathcal{F}_t$ measurable partition of the event $\{\tau \ge t, \mathrm{H} > t\}\in\mathcal{F}_t$ such that $\|\omega - \tilde\omega\| \le L\delta$ for all $\omega, \tilde\omega \in E_i$. Fix an $\omega^i \in E_i$ for each i. By the definition of $\widehat{Y}$ we have

$$
\widehat{Y}_t(\omega^i) \;\le\; \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^i}\Big[\widehat{X}^{t,\omega^i}_{\tau^i\wedge \mathrm{H}^{t,\omega^i}}\Big] + \delta \quad\text{for some}\quad (\tau^i, \mathbb{P}^i)\in\mathcal{T}^t\times\mathcal{P}_t. \tag{5.8}
$$

As in Lemma 5.1, we set $t_\delta := t + \delta < t_0$, $\tilde{B}^{t_\delta}_s := B^t_{s+\delta} - B^t_{t_\delta}$ for $s \ge t$, and $\tilde\tau^i(B^t) := [\tau^i(\tilde{B}^{t_\delta}) + \delta]\wedge t_0$. Then $\tilde\tau^i \in \mathcal{T}^t$. Moreover by Assumption 3.4 and Property (P3), for each

$\omega \in E_i$, we may define $\mathbb{P}^{i,\omega} \in \mathcal{P}_t$ as follows: $\alpha^{\mathbb{P}^{i,\omega}} := \frac{1}{\delta}(\omega^i_t - \omega_t)$, $\beta^{\mathbb{P}^{i,\omega}} := \mathbf{0}$ on $[t, t_\delta]$, and the $\mathbb{P}^{i,\omega}$-distribution of $\tilde{B}^{t_\delta}$ is equal to the $\mathbb{P}^i$-distribution of B^t. By (5.5), we have

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^i}[\widehat{X}^{t,\omega^i}_{\tau^i \wedge \mathrm{H}^{t,\omega^i}}] - \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{i,\omega}}[\widehat{X}^{t,\omega}_{\tilde{\tau}^i \wedge \mathrm{H}^{t,\omega}}] \quad \leq \quad C\rho_1(L\delta). \tag{5.9}$$

Then by Lemma 5.1 and (5.8), (5.9) we have

$$\widehat{Y}_t(\omega) \;\leq\; \widehat{Y}_t(\omega^i) + C\rho_1(L\delta) \;\leq\; \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{i,\omega}}[\widehat{X}^{t,\omega}_{\tilde{\tau}^i \wedge \mathrm{H}^{t,\omega}}] + \delta + C\rho_1(L\delta), \quad \text{for all } \omega \in E_i. \tag{5.10}$$

We next define $\tilde{\tau} \in \mathcal{T}$:

$$\tilde{\tau} := \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<t\}\cup\{\mathrm{H}\leq t\}}\tau + \sum_{i\geq 1}\mathbf{1}_{E_i}\tilde{\tau}^i(B^t), \quad \text{and then} \quad \{\tau < t\} \cup \{\mathrm{H} \leq t\} = \{\tilde{\tau} < t\} \cup \{\mathrm{H} \leq t\}.$$

Moreover, we claim that there exists $\tilde{\mathbb{P}} \in \mathcal{P}$ such that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}} = \mathbb{P} \text{ on } \mathcal{F}_t \text{ and the r.c.p.d.} \tag{5.11}$$
$$(\tilde{\mathbb{P}})^{t,\omega} = \mathbb{P}^{i,\omega} \text{ for } \mathbb{P}\text{-a.e. } \omega \in E_i \quad \text{and} \quad (\tilde{\mathbb{P}})^{t,\omega} = \mathbb{P}^{t,\omega} \text{ for } \mathbb{P}\text{-a.e. } \omega \in \{\tau < t\} \cup \{\mathrm{H} \leq t\}.$$

Then, by (5.10) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[\widehat{X}_{\tau\wedge\mathrm{H}}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<t\}\cup\{\mathrm{H}\leq t\}} + \widehat{Y}_t\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau\geq t,\mathrm{H}>t\}}\Big] = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[\widehat{X}_{\tau\wedge\mathrm{H}}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<t\}\cup\{\mathrm{H}\leq t\}} + \sum_{i\geq 1}\widehat{Y}_t\mathbf{1}_{E_i}\Big] \\
\leq\;& \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[\widehat{X}_{\tau\wedge\mathrm{H}}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<t\}\cup\{\mathrm{H}\leq t\}} + \sum_{i\geq 1}\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{i,\omega}}[\widehat{X}^{t,\omega}_{\tilde{\tau}^i\wedge\mathrm{H}^{t,\omega}}]\mathbf{1}_{E_i}\Big] + \delta + C\rho_1(L\delta) \\
=\;& \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\Big[\widehat{X}_{\tilde{\tau}\wedge\mathrm{H}}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<t\}\cup\{\mathrm{H}\leq t\}} + \sum_{i\geq 1}\widehat{X}_{\tilde{\tau}\wedge\mathrm{H}}\mathbf{1}_{E_i}\Big] + \delta + C\rho_1(L\delta) \\
=\;& \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\Big[\widehat{X}_{\tilde{\tau}\wedge\mathrm{H}}\Big] + \delta + C\rho_1(L\delta) \;\leq\; \widehat{Y}_0 + \delta + C\rho_1(L\delta),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies (5.7) by sending $\delta \to 0$. Then the reverse inequality of (5.6) follows from the arbitrariness of $\mathbb{P}$ and τ.

It remains to prove (5.11). For any $\varepsilon > 0$ and each $i \geq 1$, there exists a partition $\{E^i_j, j \geq 1\}$ of E_i such that $\|\omega - \omega'\|_t \leq \varepsilon$ for any $\omega, \omega' \in E^i_j$. Fix an $\omega^{ij} \in E^i_j$ for each (i,j). By Property (P3) we may define $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{P}$ by:

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}^\varepsilon := \mathbb{P} \otimes_t \Big[\sum_{i\geq 1}\sum_{j\geq 1}\tilde{\mathbb{P}}^{i,\omega^{ij}}\mathbf{1}_{E^i_j} + \mathbb{P}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<t\}\cup\{\mathrm{H}\leq t\}}\Big].$$

By Property (P1), $\mathcal{P}$ is weakly compact. Then $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}^\varepsilon$ has a weak limit $\tilde{\mathbb{P}} \in \mathcal{P}$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. We now show that $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ satisfies all the requirements in (5.11). Indeed, for any partition $0 = s_0 < \cdots < s_m = t < s_{m+1} < \cdots < s_M = t_\delta < s_{M+1} < \cdots < s_N = T$ and any bounded and uniformly continuous function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{N\times d} \to \mathbb{R}$, let $\xi := \varphi\big(B_{s_1} - B_{s_0}, \cdots, B_{s_N} - B_{s_{N-1}}\big)$. Then, denoting $\Delta s_k := s_{k+1} - s_k$, $\Delta \omega_k := \omega_{s_k} - \omega_{s_{k-1}}$, we see that $\mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}^{i,\omega^{ij}}}[\xi^{t,\omega}] = \eta^i_t(\omega^{i,j})$, where:

$$\eta^i_t(\omega) \;:=\; \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^i}\Big[\varphi\Big((\Delta\omega_k)_{1\le k\le m}, \frac{\omega^i_t - \omega_t}{\delta}(\Delta s_k)_{m+1\le k\le M}, (B_{s_k-\delta} - B_{s_{k-1}-\delta})_{M+1\le k\le N}\Big)\Big].$$

Let ρ denote the modulus of continuity function of φ. Then

$$|\mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}^{i,\omega^{ij}}}[\xi^{t,\omega}] - \eta^i_t(\omega)| \le \rho(2\varepsilon) \quad \text{for all} \quad \omega \in E^i_j,$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big|\mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}^{\varepsilon}}[\xi] - \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\big[\xi \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<t\}\cup\{\mathrm{H}\le t\}} + \sum_{i\ge 1}\eta^i_t \mathbf{1}_{E_i}\big]\Big| \;&=\; \Big|\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[\sum_{i,j\ge 1}\mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}^{i,\omega^{ij}}}[\xi^{t,\omega}]\mathbf{1}_{E^i_j}\Big] - \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[\sum_{i,j\ge 1}\eta^i_t \mathbf{1}_{E^i_j}\Big]\Big| \\
&\le\; \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[\sum_{i,j\ge 1}\rho(2\varepsilon)\mathbf{1}_{E^i_j}\Big] \;\le\; \rho(2\varepsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

By sending $\varepsilon \to 0$, we obtain $\mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\xi] = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\big[\xi \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<t\}\cup\{\mathrm{H}\le t\}} + \sum_{i\ge 1}\eta^i_t \mathbf{1}_{E_i}\big]$, which proves (5.11) by the arbitrariness of ξ. ■

We now prove the regularity in the t-variable.

Lemma 5.3 *Let $0 \le t_1 < \mathrm{H}(\omega^1)$, $0 \le t_2 < \mathrm{H}(\omega^2)$, and $t_1 \le t_2$. Then we have:*

$$|\widehat{Y}_{t_1}(\omega^1) - \widehat{Y}_{t_2}(\omega^2)| \;\le\; C\Big[1 + \frac{1}{d(\omega^1_{t_1}, O^c)}\Big]\rho_2\Big(\mathbf{d}_\infty\big((t_1,\omega^1),(t_2,\omega^2)\big)\Big).$$

Proof Without loss of generality we assume $t_1 < t_2$. Also, in view of the uniform continuity in ω of Lemma 5.1, it suffices to prove the lemma in the case $\omega^1 = \omega^2 = \omega$.

Denote $\delta := \mathbf{d}_\infty\big((t_1,\omega),(t_2,\omega)\big)$ and $\varepsilon := d(\omega_{t_1}, O^c)$. For $\delta \ge \frac{1}{8}$, we have $|\widehat{Y}_{t_1}(\omega) - \widehat{Y}_{t_2}(\omega)| \le 2C_0 \le C\varepsilon^{-1}\rho_2(\delta)$. So we assume in the rest of this proof that $\delta < \frac{1}{8}$.

First, by Assumption 3.4, we may consider the measure $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_{t_1}$ such that $\alpha^{\mathbb{P}}_t := 0, \beta^{\mathbb{P}}_t := 0$, $t \in [t_1, t_2]$. Then, by setting $\tau := t_0$ in Lemma 5.2, we see that $\widehat{Y}_{t_1}(\omega) \ge \mathcal{E}_{t_1}[\widehat{Y}^{t_1,\omega}_{t_2}] \ge \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[\widehat{Y}^{t_1,\omega}_{t_2}] = \widehat{Y}_{t_2}(\omega_{\cdot\wedge t_1})$. Note that $\mathrm{H}(\omega_{\cdot\wedge t_1}) = t_0 > t_2$. Thus, by Lemma 5.1,

$$\widehat{Y}_{t_2}(\omega) - \widehat{Y}_{t_1}(\omega) \;\le\; C\rho_1\Big(\mathbf{d}_\infty\big((t_2,\omega_{\cdot\wedge t_1}),(t_2,\omega)\big)\Big) \le C\rho_1(\delta) \le C\rho_2(\delta). \qquad (5.12)$$

Next, for arbitrary $\tau \in \mathcal{T}^{t_1}$, noting that $\widehat{X} \le \widehat{Y}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I &:= \mathcal{E}_{t_1}\Big[\widehat{X}^{t_1,\omega}_{\tau\wedge \mathrm{H}^{t_1,\omega}}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau\wedge \mathrm{H}^{t_1,\omega}<t_2\}} + \widehat{Y}^{t_1,\omega}_{t_2}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau\wedge \mathrm{H}^{t_1,\omega}\ge t_2\}}\Big] - \widehat{Y}_{t_2}(\omega)\\
&= \mathcal{E}_{t_1}\Big[\widehat{X}^{t_1,\omega}_{\tau}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau< \mathrm{H}^{t_1,\omega}\wedge t_2\}} + \widehat{X}^{t_1,\omega}_{\mathrm{H}^{t_1,\omega}}\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathrm{H}^{t_1,\omega}<t_2, \mathrm{H}^{t_1,\omega}\le\tau\}} + \widehat{Y}^{t_1,\omega}_{t_2}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau\wedge \mathrm{H}^{t_1,\omega}\ge t_2\}}\Big] - \widehat{Y}_{t_2}(\omega)\\
&\le \mathcal{E}_{t_1}\Big[\big(\widehat{X}^{t_1,\omega}_{\tau} - \widehat{X}^{t_1,\omega}_{\mathrm{H}^{t_1,\omega}\wedge t_2}\big)\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau< \mathrm{H}^{t_1,\omega}\wedge t_2\}} + \widehat{Y}^{t_1,\omega}_{\mathrm{H}^{t_1,\omega}\wedge t_2}\Big] - \widehat{Y}_{t_2}(\omega)\\
&\le \mathcal{E}_{t_1}\Big[\big(\widehat{X}^{t_1,\omega}_{\tau} - \widehat{X}^{t_1,\omega}_{\mathrm{H}^{t_1,\omega}\wedge t_2}\big)\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau< \mathrm{H}^{t_1,\omega}\wedge t_2\}}\Big] + \mathcal{E}_{t_1}\Big[|\widehat{Y}^{t_1,\omega}_{t_2} - \widehat{Y}_{t_2}(\omega)|\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathrm{H}^{t_1,\omega}>t_2\}}\Big]\\
&\quad +C\,\mathcal{C}_{t_1}\big[\mathrm{H}^{t_1,\omega}\le t_2\big].
\end{aligned}$$

By (5.3) and Lemma 5.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I &\le \mathcal{E}_{t_1}\Big[\rho_0\Big(\mathbf{d}_\infty((t_1,\omega),(t_2,\omega\otimes_{t_1}B^{t_1}))\Big)\Big] + C\mathcal{E}_{t_1}\Big[\rho_1\big(\|\omega-\omega\otimes_{t_1}B^{t_1}\|_{t_2}\big)\Big]\\
&\quad +C\mathcal{C}_{t_1}\big[\|B^{t_1}\|_{t_2}\ge\varepsilon\big]\\
&\le \mathcal{E}_{t_1}\Big[\rho_0\big(\delta+\|B^{t_1}\|_{t_2}\big)\Big] + C\mathcal{E}_{t_1}\Big[\rho_1\big(\delta+\|B^{t_1}\|_{t_2}\big)\Big] + C\varepsilon^{-1}\mathcal{E}_{t_1}\Big[\|B^{t_1}\|_{t_2}\Big]\\
&\le C[1+\varepsilon^{-1}]\mathcal{E}_{t_1}\Big[\rho_1\big(\delta+\|B^{t_1}\|_{t_2}\big)\Big].
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\delta\le\frac{1}{8}$ and thus $\delta+\frac{3}{4}\delta^{\frac{1}{3}}\le\delta^{\frac{1}{3}}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
I &\le C[1+\varepsilon^{-1}]\Big[\rho_1(\delta^{\frac{1}{3}}) + \mathcal{C}_{t_1}\big[\|B^{t_1}\|_{t_2}\ge\frac{3}{4}\delta^{\frac{1}{3}}\big]\Big]\\
&\le C[1+\varepsilon^{-1}]\Big[\rho_2(\delta) + \delta^{-\frac{2}{3}}\mathcal{E}_{t_1}\big[\|B^{t_1}\|^2_{t_2}\big]\Big]\\
&\le C[1+\varepsilon^{-1}]\Big[\rho_2(\delta) + \delta^{-\frac{2}{3}}\delta\Big] \le C[1+\varepsilon^{-1}]\rho_2(\delta).
\end{aligned}$$

By the arbitrariness of τ and the dynamic programming principle of Theorem 5.5, we obtain $\widehat{Y}_{t_1}(\omega)-\widehat{Y}_{t_2}(\omega)\le C\varepsilon^{-1}\rho_2(\delta)$, and the proof is complete by (5.12). ■

By Lemma 5.3, $\widehat{Y}$ is continuous for $t\in[0,\mathrm{H})$. Moreover, since $\hat{Y}$ is an $\mathcal{E}$-supermartingale, we see that $\hat{Y}_{\mathrm{H}-}$ exists. However, the following example shows that in general $\widehat{Y}$ may be discontinuous at H.

Example 5.4 Set $X_t(\omega):=t$ and let H correspond to O and t_0. Clearly $\widehat{X}=X$, $\widehat{Y}_{\mathrm{H}}=\mathrm{H}$ and $\widehat{Y}_t(\omega)\le t_0$. However, for any $t<\mathrm{H}(\omega)$, set $\tau:=t_0$ and $\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}_t$ such that $\alpha^{\mathbb{P}}=0,\beta^{\mathbb{P}}=0$, we see that $\widehat{Y}_t(\omega)\ge\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[X(\mathrm{H}(\omega\otimes_t B^t),\omega\otimes_t B^t)\Big]=X(\mathrm{H}(\omega_{\cdot\wedge t}),\omega_{\cdot\wedge t})=\mathrm{H}(\omega_{\cdot\wedge t})=t_0$. That is, $\widehat{Y}_t(\omega)=t_0$. Thus $\widehat{Y}$ is discontinuous at H whenever $\mathrm{H}(\omega)<t_0$. ■

This issue is crucial for our purpose, and we will discuss more in Subsection 5.4 below.

Applying Lemmas 5.1, 4.1, and 5.3, and following the same arguments as those of Theorem 4.3, we establish the dynamic programming principle in the present context.

Theorem 5.5 *Let $t < \mathrm{H}(\omega)$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{T}^t$. Then*

$$\widehat{Y}_t(\omega) \;=\; \sup_{\tilde\tau\in\mathcal{T}^t} \mathcal{E}_t\Big[\widehat{X}^{t,\omega}_{\tilde\tau\wedge\mathrm{H}^{t,\omega}}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde\tau\wedge\mathrm{H}^{t,\omega}<\tau\}} + \widehat{Y}^{t,\omega}_{\tau}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde\tau\wedge\mathrm{H}^{t,\omega}\geq\tau\}}\Big].$$

Consequently, $\widehat{Y}$ is a $\mathcal{E}-$supermartingale on $[0,\mathrm{H}]$.

5.2 Continuous approximation of the hitting times

Similar to the proof of Theorem 3.3, we need to reduce our limiting argument to the context of Proposition 2.2 (iii). We therefore introduce the stopping times; for any $n \geq 1$,

$$\mathrm{H}_n := \inf\big\{t\geq 0 : \mathbf{d}(\omega_t, O^c) \leq \frac{1}{n}\big\}\wedge(t_0 - \frac{1}{n}), \quad \tau_n := \inf\{t\geq 0 : \widehat{Y}_t - \widehat{X}_t \leq \frac{1}{n}\}. \tag{5.13}$$

Here we abuse the notation slightly by using the same notation τ_n as in (4.7). Our main task in this subsection is to build an approximation of H_n and τ_n by continuous random variables. This will be obtained by a repeated use of Lemma 4.5.

We start by a continuous approximation of the sequence $(\mathrm{H}_n)_{n\geq 1}$ defined in (5.13).

Lemma 5.6 *For all $m \geq 2$:*

(i) $\mathrm{H}_{m-1}(\omega) \leq \mathrm{H}_m(\omega') \leq \mathrm{H}_{m+1}(\omega)$, *whenever* $\|\omega-\omega'\|_{t_0} \leq \frac{1}{m(m+1)}$,

(ii) *there exists an open subset $\Omega_0^m \subset \Omega$, and a uniformly continuous $\hat{\mathrm{H}}_m$ such that*

$$\mathcal{C}\big[(\Omega_0^m)^c\big] < 2^{-m} \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathrm{H}_{m-1} - 2^{-m} \leq \hat{\mathrm{H}}_m \leq \mathrm{H}_{m+1} + 2^{-m} \quad \textit{on} \quad \Omega_0^m,$$

(iii) *there exist $\delta_m > 0$ such that $|\hat{\mathrm{H}}_m(\omega) - \hat{\mathrm{H}}_m(\omega')| \leq 2^{-m}$ whenever $\|\omega-\omega'\|_{t_0} \leq \delta_m$, and:*

$$\mathcal{C}\big[(\hat\Omega_0^m)^c\big] \leq 2^{-m} \quad \textit{where} \quad \hat\Omega_0^m := \{\omega\in\Omega_0^m : \mathbf{d}(\omega, [\Omega_0^m]^c) > \delta_m\}.$$

Proof Notice that (ii) is a direct consequence of (i) obtained by applying Lemma 4.5 with $\varepsilon = 2^{-m}$. To prove (i), we observe that for $\|\omega-\omega'\|_{t_0} \leq \frac{1}{m(m+1)}$ and $t < \mathrm{H}_m(\omega')$, we have

$$\mathbf{d}(\omega_t, O^c) \geq \mathbf{d}(\omega'_t, O^c) - \frac{1}{m(m+1)} > \frac{1}{m} - \frac{1}{m(m+1)} = \frac{1}{m+1}.$$

This shows that $\mathrm{H}_m(\omega') \leq \mathrm{H}_{m+1}(\omega)$ whenever $\|\omega-\omega'\|_{t_0} \leq \frac{1}{m(m+1)}$. Similarly, $\mathrm{H}_{m-1}(\omega) \leq \mathrm{H}_m(\omega')$ whenever $\|\omega-\omega'\|_{t_0} \leq \frac{1}{m(m-1)}$, and the inequality (i) follows.

It remains to prove (iii). The first claim follows from the uniform continuity of $\hat{\mathrm{H}}_m$. For each $\delta > 0$, define $h_\delta : [0,\infty) \to [0,1]$ as follows: $h_\delta(x) := 1$ for $x \leq \delta$, $h_\delta(x) = 0$ for $x \geq 2\delta$, and h_δ is linear on $[\delta, 2\delta]$. Then the map $\omega \longmapsto \psi_\delta(\omega) := h_\delta(d(\omega, [\Omega_0^m]^c))$ is continuous, and $\psi_\delta \downarrow \mathbf{1}_{[\Omega_0^m]^c}$ as $\delta \downarrow 0$. Since $\mathcal{P}$ is weakly compact, by [3] Theorem 28, we have

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0}\mathcal{E}[\psi_\delta] = \mathcal{E}\big[\mathbf{1}_{(\Omega_0^m)^c}\big] = \sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}}\mathbb{P}\big[(\Omega_0^m)^c\big] < 2^{-m}.$$

By definition of $\hat\Omega^m_0$, notice that $\mathbf{1}_{(\hat\Omega^m_0)^c} \le \psi_{\delta_m}$. Then $\mathcal{C}\big[(\hat\Omega^m_0)^c\big] \le \mathcal{E}[\psi_{\delta_m}]$, and (iii) holds true for sufficiently small δ_m. ■

We next derive a continuous approximation of the sequences

$$\tau^m_n := \tau_n \wedge \hat{\mathrm{H}}_m, \quad n, m \ge 1. \tag{5.14}$$

where τ_n and $\hat{\mathrm{H}}_m$ are defined in (5.13) and Lemma 5.6 (ii), respectively.

Lemma 5.7 *For all $n, m \ge 2$, there exists an open subset $\Omega^m_n \subset \Omega$ and a uniformly continuous map $\hat\tau^m_n$ such that*

$$\tau^m_{n-1} - 2^{1-m} - 2^{-n} \le \hat\tau^m_n \le \tau^m_{n+1} + 2^{1-m} + 2^{-n} \text{ on } \hat\Omega^m_0 \cap \Omega^m_n, \text{ and } \mathcal{C}\big[(\Omega^m_n)^c\big] \le 2^{-n}.$$

Proof Fix m, and recall the modulus of continuity ρ_1 introduced in (5.4). For each n, let $0 < \delta^m_n < \delta^m$ such that $(\rho_0 + C\rho_1)(\delta^m_n) \le \frac{1}{n(n+1)}$, where C is the constant in Lemma 5.1 . We shall prove

$$(\tau_{n-1} \wedge \hat{\mathrm{H}}_m)(\omega) - 2^{1-m} \le (\tau_n \wedge \hat{\mathrm{H}}_m)(\omega') \le (\tau_{n+1} \wedge \hat{\mathrm{H}}_m)(\omega) + 2^{1-m} \tag{5.15}$$
$$\text{whenever } \omega \in \hat\Omega^m_0, \quad \|\omega - \omega'\|_{t_0} \le \delta^m_n.$$

Then the required statement follows from Lemma 4.5 with $\varepsilon = 2^{-n}$.

We shall prove only the right inequality of (5.15). The left one can be proved similarly. Let ω, ω' be as in (5.15). First, by Lemma 5.6 (iii) we have

$$\omega' \in \Omega^m_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mathrm{H}}_m(\omega') \le \hat{\mathrm{H}}_m(\omega) + 2^{-m} \tag{5.16}$$

We now prove the right inequality of (5.15) in three cases.

Case 1. if $\tau_{n+1}(\omega) \ge \hat{\mathrm{H}}_m(\omega') - 2^{-m}$, then $\hat{\mathrm{H}}_m(\omega') \le (\tau_{n+1} \wedge \hat{\mathrm{H}}_m)(\omega) + 2^{-m}$ and thus the result is true.

Case 2. If $\tau_{n+1}(\omega) = \mathrm{H}(\omega)$, then by Lemma 5.6 (ii) we have $\hat{\mathrm{H}}_m(\omega) \le \mathrm{H}_{m+1}(\omega) + 2^{-m} \le \tau_{n+1}(\omega) + 2^{-m}$, and thus $\hat{\mathrm{H}}_m(\omega') \le \hat{\mathrm{H}}_m(\omega) + 2^{-m} \le \tau_{n+1}(\omega) + 2^{1-m}$. This, together with (5.16), proves the desired inequality.

Case 3. We now assume $\tau_{n+1}(\omega) < \hat{\mathrm{H}}_m(\omega') - 2^{-m}$ and $\tau_{n+1}(\omega) < \mathrm{H}(\omega)$. By Lemma 5.6 (ii) we have $\tau_{n+1}(\omega) < \mathrm{H}_{m+1}(\omega')$, and thus $\tau_{n+1}(\omega) < \mathrm{H}(\omega')$. Then it follows from Lemma 5.1 that

$$(Y - X)_{\tau_{n+1}(\omega)}(\omega') \le (Y - X)_{\tau_{n+1}(\omega)}(\omega) + (\rho_0 + C\rho_1)(\delta^m_n) \le \frac{1}{n+1} + \frac{1}{n(n+1)} = \frac{1}{n}.$$

That is, $\tau_n(\omega') \le \tau_{n+1}(\omega)$. This, together with (5.16), proves the desired inequality. ■

For our final approximation result, we introduce the notations:

$$\bar{\tau}_n := \tau_n \wedge \mathrm{H}_n, \quad \underline{\theta}_n^* := \hat{\tau}_{n-1}^{n-1} - 2^{3-n}, \quad \overline{\theta}_n^* := \hat{\tau}_{n+1}^{n+1} + 2^{1-n}, \tag{5.17}$$

and

$$\Omega_n^* := \hat{\Omega}_0^{n-1} \cap \Omega_{n-1}^{n-1} \cap \hat{\Omega}_0^{n+1} \cap \Omega_{n+1}^{n+1}. \tag{5.18}$$

Lemma 5.8 *For all $n \ge 1$, $\underline{\theta}_n^*, \overline{\theta}_n^*$ are uniformly continuous, and $\underline{\theta}_n^* \le \bar{\tau}_n \le \overline{\theta}_n^*$ on Ω_n^*.*

Proof This is a direct combination of Lemmas 5.6 and 5.7.

5.3 Proof of Theorem 3.5

We first prove the $\mathcal{E}$-martingale property under an additional condition.

Lemma 5.9 *Let $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $\tau \le \tau^*$ and $\mathcal{E}[Y_{\tau-}] = \mathcal{E}[Y_\tau]$ (in particular if $\tau < \mathrm{H}$). Then $\widehat{Y}$ is an $\mathcal{E}$-martingale on $[0, \tau]$.*

Proof If $\widehat{Y}_0 = \widehat{X}_0$, then $\widehat{\tau}^* = 0$ and obviously the statement is true. We then assume $\widehat{Y}_0 > \widehat{X}_0$, and prove the lemma in several steps.

Step 1 Let n be sufficiently large so that $\frac{1}{n} < \widehat{Y}_0 - \widehat{X}_0$. Follow the same arguments as that of Lemma 4.4 , one can easily prove:

$$\widehat{Y} \quad \text{is an} \quad \mathcal{E} - \text{martingale on} \quad [0, \tau_n]. \tag{5.19}$$

Step 2 Recall the sequence of stopping times $(\bar{\tau}_n)_{n\ge1}$ introduced in (5.17). By Step 1 we have $\widehat{Y}_0 = \mathcal{E}[\widehat{Y}_{\bar{\tau}_n}]$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\mathbb{P}_n \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\widehat{Y}_0 - \varepsilon < \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_n}[\widehat{Y}_{\bar{\tau}_n}]$. Since $\mathcal{P}$ is weakly compact, there exists subsequence $\{n_j\}$ and $\mathbb{P}^* \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\mathbb{P}_{n_j}$ converges weakly to $\mathbb{P}^*$. Now for any n and $n_j \ge n$, since Y is a supermartingale under each $\mathbb{P}_{n_j}$ and $(\bar{\tau}_n)_{n\ge1}$ is increasing, we have

$$\widehat{Y}_0 - \varepsilon \;<\; \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{n_j}}\big[\widehat{Y}_{\bar{\tau}_{n_j}}\big] \;\le\; \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{n_j}}\big[\widehat{Y}_{\bar{\tau}_n}\big]. \tag{5.20}$$

Our next objective is to send $j \nearrow \infty$, for fixed n, and use the weak convergence of $\mathbb{P}^{n_j}$ towards $\mathbb{P}^*$. To do this, we need to approximate $\widehat{Y}_{\bar{\tau}_n}$ with continuous random variables. Denote

$$\psi_n(\omega) := h_n\Big(\inf_{0 \le t \le \overline{\theta}_n^*(\omega)} \mathbf{d}(\omega_t, O^c)\Big) \text{ with } h_n(x) := 1 \wedge [(n+3)(n+4)x - (n+3)]^+. \tag{5.21}$$

Then ψ_n is continuous in ω, and

$$\{\psi_n>0\}\subset\big\{\inf_{0\le t\le\overline{\theta}^*_n(\omega)}\mathbf{d}(\omega_t,O^c)>\tfrac{1}{n+4}\big\}\subset\{\overline{\theta}^*_n<\textsc{h}_{n+4}\}. \tag{5.22}$$

In particular, this implies that $\widehat{Y}_{\underline{\theta}^*_n}\psi_n$ and $\widehat{Y}_{\overline{\theta}^*_n}\psi_n$ are continuous in ω. We now decompose the right hand-side term of (5.20) into:

$$\widehat{Y}_0-\varepsilon \quad\le\quad \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{n_j}}\Big[\big[\widehat{Y}_{\underline{\theta}^*_n}+(\widehat{Y}_{\bar\tau_n}-\widehat{Y}_{\underline{\theta}^*_n})\mathbf{1}_{\Omega^*_n}\big]\big(\psi_n+(1-\psi_n)\big)+(\widehat{Y}_{\bar\tau_n}-\widehat{Y}_{\underline{\theta}^*_n})\mathbf{1}_{(\Omega^*_n)^c}\Big].$$

Note that $\underline{\theta}^*_n\le\bar\tau_n\le\overline{\theta}^*_n$ on Ω^*_n. Then

$$\widehat{Y}_0-\varepsilon \quad\le\quad \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{n_j}}\Big[\psi_n\Big(\widehat{Y}_{\underline{\theta}^*_n}+\sup_{\underline{\theta}^*_n\le t\le\overline{\theta}^*_n}(\widehat{Y}_t-\widehat{Y}_{\underline{\theta}^*_n})\Big)\Big]+C\mathcal{E}[1-\psi_n]+C\mathcal{C}\big[(\Omega^*_n)^c\big].$$

Send $j\to\infty$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{Y}_0-\varepsilon \quad&\le\quad \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^*}\Big[\psi_n\widehat{Y}_{\underline{\theta}^*_n}\Big]+\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^*}\Big[\psi_n\sup_{\underline{\theta}^*_n\le t\le\overline{\theta}^*_n}(\widehat{Y}_t-\widehat{Y}_{\underline{\theta}^*_n})\Big]+C\mathcal{E}[1-\psi_n]+C\mathcal{C}[(\Omega^*_n)^c]\\ &=:\quad A_n+B_n+C_n+D_n.\end{aligned} \tag{5.23}$$

Step 3. In this step we show that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}[B_n+C_n+D_n]=0. \tag{5.24}$$

(i) First, by the definition of Ω^*_n in (5.18) together with Lemmas 5.6 (iii) and 5.7, it follows that $D_n=C\mathcal{C}\big[(\Omega^*_n)^c\big]\longrightarrow0$ as $n\to\infty$.

(ii) Next, notice that

$$\{\psi_n<1\}\;=\;\big\{\inf_{0\le t\le\overline{\theta}^*_n(\omega)}\mathbf{d}(\omega_t,O^c)<\tfrac{1}{n+3}\big\}\;\subset\;\{\overline{\theta}^*_n>\textsc{h}_{n+3}\}.$$

Moreover, by (5.17) and Lemma 5.8,

$$\overline{\theta}^*_n=\hat\tau^{n+1}_{n+1}+2^{1-n}=\underline{\theta}^*_{n+2}+2^{2-n}\le\bar\tau_{n+2}+2^{2-n}\le\textsc{h}_{n+2}+2^{2-n},\quad\text{on}\quad\Omega^*_{n+2}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\{\psi_n<1\}\quad&\subset\quad(\Omega^*_{n+2})^c\cup\big\{\textsc{h}_{n+3}<\textsc{h}_{n+2}+2^{2-n}\big\}\\ &\subset\quad(\Omega^*_{n+2})^c\cup\Big\{\sup_{\textsc{h}_{n+2}\le t\le\textsc{h}_{n+2}+2^{2-n}}|B_t-B_{\textsc{h}_{n+2}}|\ge\tfrac{1}{(n+2)(n+3)}\Big\}.\end{aligned}$$

Then one can easily see that $C_n\le C\mathcal{C}[\psi_n<1]\to0$, as $n\to\infty$.

(iii) Finally, it is clear that $\underline{\theta}^*_n\to\widehat{\tau}^*$, $\overline{\theta}^*_n\to\widehat{\tau}^*$. Recall that $\widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^*-}$ exists. By (5.22), we see that $\psi_n\sup_{\underline{\theta}^*_n\le t\le\overline{\theta}^*_n}(\widehat{Y}_t-\widehat{Y}_{\underline{\theta}^*_n})\to0$, dbP^*-a.s. as $n\to\infty$. Then by applying the dominated convergence theorem under $\mathbb{P}^*$ we obtain $B_n\to0$ as $n\to\infty$.

Step 4. By the dominated convergence theorem under $\mathbb{P}^*$ we obtain $\lim_{n\to\infty} A_n = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^*}[\widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^*-}]$. This, together with (5.23) and (5.24), implies that

$$\widehat{Y}_0 \le \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^*}[\widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^*-}] + \varepsilon.$$

Note that $\widehat{Y}$ is an $\mathbb{P}^*$-supermartingale and $\tau \le \widehat{\tau}^*$, then

$$\widehat{Y}_0 \le \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^*}[\widehat{Y}_{\tau-}] + \varepsilon.$$

Since ε is arbitrary, we obtain $\widehat{Y}_0 \le \mathcal{E}[\widehat{Y}_{\tau-}]$, and thus by the assumption $\mathcal{E}[\widehat{Y}_{\tau-}] = \mathcal{E}[\widehat{Y}_{\tau}]$ we have $\widehat{Y}_0 \le \mathcal{E}[\widehat{Y}_{\tau}]$. This, together with the fact that $\widehat{Y}$ is a $\mathcal{E}$-supermartingale, implies that

$$\widehat{Y}_0 = \mathcal{E}[\widehat{Y}_{\tau}]. \tag{5.25}$$

Similarly, one can prove $\widehat{Y}_t(\omega) = \mathcal{E}_t[\widehat{Y}^{t,\omega}_{\tau^{t,\omega}}]$ for $t < \tau(\omega)$, and thus $\widehat{Y}_{.\wedge\tau}$ is a $\mathcal{E}$-martingale. ■

In light of Lemma 5.9, the following result is obviously important for us.

Proposition 5.10 *It holds that* $\mathcal{E}[\widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^*-}] = \mathcal{E}[\widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^*}]$.

We recall again that $\widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^*-} = \widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^*}$ whenever $\widehat{\tau}^* < \text{H}$. So the only possible discontinuity is at H. The proof of Proposition 5.10 is reported in Subsection 5.4 below. Let us first show how it allows to complete the

Proof of Theorem 3.5 By (5.25) and Proposition 5.10, we have $\widehat{Y}_0 = \mathcal{E}[\widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^*}]$. Similarly, one can prove $\widehat{Y}_t(\omega) = \mathcal{E}_t[\widehat{Y}^{t,\omega}_{(\widehat{\tau}^*)^{t,\omega}}]$ for $t < \widehat{\tau}^*(\omega)$, and thus $\widehat{Y}$ is a $\mathcal{E}$-martingale on $[0, \widehat{\tau}^*]$. Moreover, since $\widehat{X}_{\widehat{\tau}^*} = \widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^*}$, then $Y_0 = \mathcal{E}[\widehat{X}_{\widehat{\tau}^*}]$ and thus $\widehat{\tau}^*$ is an optimal stopping time. ■

5.4 $\mathcal{E}-$Continuity of $\widehat{Y}$ at the random maturity

This subsection is dedicated to the proof of Proposition 5.10. We first reformulate some pathwise properties established in previous subsections. For that purpose, we introduce the following additional notation: for any $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$, $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, and $E \in \mathcal{F}_\tau$

$$\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P}, \tau, E) := \Big\{\mathbb{P}' \in \mathcal{P} : \mathbb{P}' = \mathbb{P} \otimes_\tau \big[\mathbb{P}'\mathbf{1}_E + \mathbb{P}\mathbf{1}_{E^c}\big]\Big\}, \quad \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P}, \tau) := \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P}, \tau, \Omega). \tag{5.26}$$

The first result corresponds to Theorem 5.5.

Lemma 5.11 *Let* $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$*,* $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in \mathcal{T}$*, and* $E \in \mathcal{F}_{\tau_1}$*. Assume* $\tau_1 \le \tau_2 \le \text{H}$ *and* $\tau_1 < \text{H}$ *on* E*. Then for any* $\varepsilon > 0$*, there exist* $\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P}, \tau_1, E)$ *and* $\tau_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{T}$ *with values in* $[\tau_1, \tau_2]$*, s.t.*

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[\widehat{Y}_{\tau_1}\mathbf{1}_E\Big] \le \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon}\Big[\big[\widehat{X}_{\tau_\varepsilon}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_\varepsilon < \tau_2\}} + \widehat{Y}_{\tau_2}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_\varepsilon = \tau_2\}}\big]\mathbf{1}_E\Big] + \varepsilon.$$

Proof Let τ_1^n be a sequence of stopping times such that $\tau_1^n \downarrow \tau$ and each τ_1^n takes only finitely many values. Applying Lemma 5.3 together with the dominated convergence Theorem under $\mathbb{P}$, we see that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[|\widehat{Y}_{\tau_1^n\wedge\tau_2} - \widehat{Y}_{\tau_1}|\Big] = 0$. Fix n such that

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[|\widehat{Y}_{\tau_1^n\wedge\tau_2} - \widehat{Y}_{\tau_1}|\Big] \le \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \tag{5.27}$$

Assume τ_1^n takes values $\{t_i, i = 1,\cdots,m\}$, and for each i, denote $E_i := E\cap\{\tau_1^n = t_i < \tau_2\} \in \mathcal{F}_{t_i}$. By (5.10) and (5.11), there exists $\tilde\tau_i \in \mathcal{T}$ and $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P}, t_i)$ such that $\tilde\tau_i \ge t_i$ and

$$\widehat{Y}_{t_i} \le \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i}_{t_i}\Big[\widehat{X}_{\tilde\tau_i\wedge \mathrm{H}}\Big] + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s. on } E_i.$$

Define

$$\tilde\tau := \tau_2 \mathbf{1}_{E^c\cup\{\tau_2\le\tau_1^n\}} + \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde\tau_i \mathbf{1}_{E_i}, \qquad \tilde{\mathbb{P}} := \mathbb{P}\mathbf{1}_{E^c\cup\{\tau_2\le\tau_1^n\}} + \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i \mathbf{1}_{E_i}.$$

Then one can check straightforwardly that $\tilde\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, $\tilde{\mathbb{P}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P}, \tau_2\wedge\tau_1^n, E) \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P}, \tau_1, E)$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\big[\widehat{Y}_{\tau_2\wedge\tau_1^n}\mathbf{1}_E\big] &= \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\Big[\big[\widehat{Y}_{\tau_2}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_2\le\tau_1^n\}} + \sum_{i=1}^m \widehat{Y}_{t_i}\mathbf{1}_{E_i}\big]\mathbf{1}_E\Big] \\
&\le \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\Big[\big[\widehat{Y}_{\tau_2}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_2\le\tau_1^n\}} + (\widehat{X}_{\tilde\tau\wedge\mathrm{H}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2})\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_1^n<\tau_2\}}\big]\mathbf{1}_E\Big]
\end{aligned}$$

This, together with (5.27), leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\Big[\big(\widehat{Y}_{\tau_1} - \widehat{X}_{\tilde\tau}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde\tau<\tau_2\}} - \widehat{Y}_{\tau_2}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde\tau\ge\tau_2\}}\big)\mathbf{1}_E\Big] \\
\le\ & \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\mathbb{P}(E) + \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\Big[\big(\widehat{Y}_{\tau_2}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_2\le\tau_1^n\}} + \widehat{X}_{\tilde\tau\wedge\mathrm{H}}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_1^n<\tau_2\}} - \widehat{X}_{\tilde\tau}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde\tau<\tau_2\}} - \widehat{Y}_{\tau_2}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde\tau\ge\tau_2\}}\big)\mathbf{1}_E\Big] \\
\le\ & \varepsilon + \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\Big[\big(\widehat{X}_{\tilde\tau\wedge\mathrm{H}} - \widehat{Y}_{\tau_2}\big)\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_1^n<\tau_2\le\tilde\tau\}}\mathbf{1}_E\Big] \\
=\ & \varepsilon + \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\Big[\big(\mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}_{\tau_2}[\widehat{X}_{\tilde\tau\wedge\mathrm{H}}] - \widehat{Y}_{\tau_2}\big)\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_1^n<\tau_2\le\tilde\tau\}}\mathbf{1}_E\Big] \le \varepsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the definition of $\widehat{Y}$. ■

Next result corresponds to Lemma 5.9.

Lemma 5.12 *Let $\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}$, $\tau\in\mathcal{T}$, and $E\in\mathcal{F}_\tau$ such that $\tau\le\widehat{\tau}^*$ on E. Then for all $\varepsilon>0$:*

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\big[\mathbf{1}_E\widehat{Y}_\tau\big] \le \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon}\big[\mathbf{1}_E\widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^*-}\big] + \varepsilon \quad \textit{for some} \quad \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P},\tau,E).$$

Proof We proceed in three steps.

Step 1. We first assume $\tau = t < \widehat{\tau}^*$ on E. We shall prove the result following the arguments in Lemma 5.9. Recall the notations in Subsection 5.2 and the ψ_n defined in (5.21), and let ρ_n denote the modulus of continuity functions of $\underline{\theta}^*_n$, $\overline{\theta}^*_n$, and ψ_n.

Fix $n \geq 1$ and $\delta > 0$ which will be decided later. Denote $\bar{\tau}_0 := 0$, and let $\{E_i^{n,\delta}, i \geq 1\} \subset \mathcal{F}_t$ be a partition of $E \cap \{\bar{\tau}_{n-1} \leq t < \bar{\tau}_n\}$ such that $\|\omega - \omega'\|_t \leq \delta$ for any $\omega, \omega' \in E_i^{n,\delta}$. For each (n,i), fix $\omega^{n,i} := \omega^{n,\delta,i} \in E_i^{n,\delta}$. By (5.25), $\widehat{Y}\mathbf{1}_{E_i^{n,\delta}}$ is an $\mathcal{E}$-martingale on $[t, \bar{\tau}_n]$. Then $\widehat{Y}_t(\omega^{n,i}) = \mathcal{E}_t[\widehat{Y}^{t,\omega^{n,i}}_{\bar{\tau}_n^{t,\omega^{n,i}}}]$, and thus there exists $\mathbb{P}_i^{n,\delta} \in \mathcal{P}_t$ such that

$$\widehat{Y}_t(\omega^{n,i}) \leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_i^{n,\delta}}\Big[\widehat{Y}^{t,\omega^{n,i}}_{\bar{\tau}_n^{t,\omega^{n,i}}}\Big] + \varepsilon. \tag{5.28}$$

Note that $\cup_{m=1}^n \cup_{i\geq 1} E_i^{m,\delta} = E \cap \{t < \bar{\tau}_n\}$. Set

$$\mathbb{P}^{n,\delta} \;:=\; \mathbb{P} \otimes_t \Big[\sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{i\geq 1} \mathbb{P}_i^{m,\delta}\mathbf{1}_{E_i^{m,\delta}} + \mathbb{P}\mathbf{1}_{E^c \cup \{t \geq \bar{\tau}_n\}}\Big] \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P}, t, E). \tag{5.29}$$

We claim that, for any $N \geq n$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[\widehat{Y}_t\mathbf{1}_E] - \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{N,\delta}}[\widehat{Y}_{t\vee\underline{\theta}^*_n}\psi_n\mathbf{1}_E] \\
\leq\;& Cn\mathcal{E}\Big[\rho_2\Big(\delta + \rho_n(\delta) + 2\eta_n(\delta)\Big)\Big] + C\rho_n(\delta) + \varepsilon + C2^{-n} + C\mathcal{C}(\psi_n < 1) \\
&+2\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{N,\delta}}\Big[\sup_{\underline{\theta}^*_n \leq s \leq \overline{\theta}^*_n} |\widehat{Y}_s - \widehat{Y}_{\underline{\theta}^*_n}|\psi_n\mathbf{1}_E\Big] + C\mathcal{C}\Big[0 < d\big(\omega, (\Omega^*_n)^c\big) < \delta\Big], \qquad (5.30)\\
&\text{where}\quad \eta_n(\delta) := \sup_{t\leq s_1 < s_2 \leq t_0,\, s_2 - s_1 \leq \rho_n(\delta)} |B^t_{s_1} - B^t_{s_2}|.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, one can easily find $\mathcal{F}_t$-measurable continuous random variable φ_k such that $|\varphi_k| \leq 1$ and $\lim_{k\to\infty}\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[|\mathbf{1}_E - \varphi_k|] = 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[\widehat{Y}_t\mathbf{1}_E] - \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{N,\delta}}[\widehat{Y}_{t\vee\underline{\theta}^*_n}\psi_n\varphi_k] \\
\leq\;& Cn\mathcal{E}\Big[\rho_2\Big(\delta + \rho_n(\delta) + 2\eta_n(\delta)\Big)\Big] + C\rho_n(\delta) + \varepsilon + C2^{-n} + C\mathcal{C}(\psi_n < 1) \\
&+C\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{N,\delta}}\Big[\sup_{\underline{\theta}^*_n \leq s \leq \overline{\theta}^*_n} |\widehat{Y}_s - \widehat{Y}_{\underline{\theta}^*_n}|\psi_n\varphi_k\Big] + C\mathcal{C}\Big[0 < d\big(\omega, (\Omega^*_n)^c\big) < \delta\Big] + C\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[|\mathbf{1}_E - \varphi_k|].
\end{aligned}$$

For each N, by the weak compactness assumption (P1) we see that $\mathbb{P}^{N,\delta}$ has a weak limit $\mathbb{P}^N \in \mathcal{P}$ as $\delta \to 0$. It is straightforward to check that $\mathbb{P}^N \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P}, t, E)$. Note that the random variables $\widehat{Y}_{t\vee\underline{\theta}^*_n}\psi_n\varphi_k$, $\sup_{\underline{\theta}^*_n \leq s \leq \overline{\theta}^*_n} |\widehat{Y}_s - \widehat{Y}_{\underline{\theta}^*_n}|\psi_n\varphi_k$, and $\eta_n(\delta)$ are continuous, and $\{\omega : 0 < d\big(\omega, (\Omega^*_n)^c\big) < \delta\}$ is an open set. Send $\delta \to 0$ and apply Proposition 2.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[\widehat{Y}_t\mathbf{1}_E] - \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^N}[\widehat{Y}_{t\vee\underline{\theta}^*_n}\psi_n\varphi_k] \\
\leq\;& \varepsilon + C2^{-n} + C\mathcal{C}(\psi_n < 1) + C\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^N}\Big[\sup_{\underline{\theta}^*_n \leq s \leq \overline{\theta}^*_n} |\widehat{Y}_s - \widehat{Y}_{\underline{\theta}^*_n}|\psi_n\varphi_k\Big] + C\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[|\mathbf{1}_E - \varphi_k|].
\end{aligned}$$

Again by the weak compactness assumption (P1), $\mathbb{P}^N$ has a weak limit $\mathbb{P}^* \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P}, t, E)$ as $N \to \infty$. Now send $N \to \infty$, by the continuity of the random variables we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[\widehat{Y}_t \mathbf{1}_E] - \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^*}[\widehat{Y}_{t\vee\underline{\theta}_n^*}\psi_n\varphi_k] \\ \leq\ & \varepsilon + C2^{-n} + C\mathcal{C}(\psi_n < 1) + C\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^*}\Big[\sup_{\underline{\theta}_n^* \leq s \leq \overline{\theta}_n^*} |\widehat{Y}_s - \widehat{Y}_{\underline{\theta}_n^*}|\psi_n\varphi_k\Big] + C\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[|\mathbf{1}_E - \varphi_k|]. \end{aligned}$$

Send $k \to \infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[\widehat{Y}_t \mathbf{1}_E] - \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^*}[\widehat{Y}_{t\vee\underline{\theta}_n^*}\psi_n 1_E] \\ \leq\ & \varepsilon + C2^{-n} + C\mathcal{C}(\psi_n < 1) + 2\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^*}\Big[\sup_{\underline{\theta}_n^* \leq s \leq \overline{\theta}_n^*} |\widehat{Y}_s - \widehat{Y}_{\underline{\theta}_n^*}|\psi_n\mathbf{1}_E\Big]. \end{aligned}$$

Finally send $n \to \infty$, by Proposition 2.2 (i) and applying the dominated convergence theorem under $\mathbb{P}$ and $\mathbb{P}^*$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[\widehat{Y}_t \mathbf{1}_E] - \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^*}[\widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^*-} 1_E] \quad\leq\quad \varepsilon.$$

That is, $\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon := \mathbb{P}^*$ satisfies the requirement in the case $\tau = t < \widehat{\tau}^*$ on E.

Step 2. We now prove Claim (5.30). Indeed, for any $m \leq n$ and any $\omega \in E_i^{m,\delta}$, by Lemma 5.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \widehat{Y}_t(\omega) - \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_i^{m,\delta}}\Big[\widehat{Y}^{t,\omega}_{\bar{\tau}_n^{t,\omega}}\Big] \\ =\ & \widehat{Y}_t(\omega) - \widehat{Y}_t(\omega^{m,i}) + \widehat{Y}_t(\omega^{m,i}) - \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_i^{m,\delta}}\Big[\widehat{Y}^{t,\omega^{m,i}}_{\bar{\tau}_n^{t,\omega^{m,i}}}\Big] + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_i^{m,\delta}}\Big[\widehat{Y}^{t,\omega^{m,i}}_{\bar{\tau}_n^{t,\omega^{m,i}}} - \widehat{Y}^{t,\omega}_{\bar{\tau}_n^{t,\omega}}\Big] \\ \leq\ & C\rho_1(\delta) + \varepsilon + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_i^{m,\delta}}\Big[\big|\widehat{Y}^{t,\omega^{m,i}}_{\bar{\tau}_n^{t,\omega^{m,i}}} - \widehat{Y}^{t,\omega}_{\bar{\tau}_n^{t,\omega}}\big|\mathbf{1}_{(\Omega_n^*)^{t,\omega^{m,i}} \cap (\Omega_n^*)^{t,\omega}}\psi_n^{t,\omega^{m,i}}\psi_n^{t,\omega}\Big] \qquad (5.31) \\ & + C\mathbb{P}_i^{m,\delta}\Big[[(\Omega_n^*)^{t,\omega^{m,i}}]^c \cup [(\Omega_n^*)^{t,\omega}]^c\Big] + C\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_i^{m,\delta}}\Big[1 - \psi_n^{t,\omega^{m,i}} + 1 - \psi_n^{t,\omega}\Big]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_i^{m,\delta}}\Big[1 - \psi_n^{t,\omega^{m,i}} + 1 - \psi_n^{t,\omega}\Big] &\leq 2\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_i^{m,\delta}}\Big[1 - \psi_n^{t,\omega}\Big] + \rho_n(\delta); \\ \mathbb{P}_i^{m,\delta}\Big[[(\Omega_n^*)^{t,\omega^{m,i}}]^c \cup [(\Omega_n^*)^{t,\omega}]^c\Big] &\leq 2\mathbb{P}_i^{m,\delta}\Big[[(\Omega_n^*)^{t,\omega}]^c\Big] + \mathbb{P}_i^{m,\delta}\Big[[(\Omega_n^*)^{t,\omega^{m,i}}]^c \cap (\Omega_n^*)^{t,\omega}\Big] \quad (5.32) \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{P}_i^{m,\delta}\Big[[(\Omega_n^*)^{t,\omega}]^c\Big] + \mathbb{P}_i^{m,\delta}\Big[0 < d\big(\omega \otimes_t B^t, (\Omega_n^*)^c\big) < \delta\Big]. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, on $(\Omega_n^*)^{t,\omega^{m,i}} \cap (\Omega_n^*)^{t,\omega} \cap \{\psi_n^{t,\omega^{m,i}} > 0\} \cap \{\psi_n^{t,\omega} > 0\}$, by Lemma 5.8 and (5.22) we have

$$(\underline{\theta}_n^*)^{t,\omega^{m,i}} \leq \bar{\tau}_n^{t,\omega^{m,i}} \leq (\overline{\theta}_n^*)^{t,\omega^{m,i}} < \mathrm{H}_{n+4}^{t,\omega^{m,i}}; \quad (\underline{\theta}_n^*)^{t,\omega} \leq \bar{\tau}_n^{t,\omega} \leq (\overline{\theta}_n^*)^{t,\omega} < \mathrm{H}_{n+4}^{t,\omega}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\big|\widehat{Y}^{t,\omega^{m,i}}_{\bar{\tau}_n^{t,\omega^{m,i}}} - \widehat{Y}^{t,\omega}_{\bar{\tau}_n^{t,\omega}}\big| &\le \big|\widehat{Y}^{t,\omega^{m,i}}_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega^{m,i}}} - \widehat{Y}^{t,\omega}_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega}}\big| \\
&\quad + \sup_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega^{m,i}} \le s \le (\overline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega^{m,i}}} |\widehat{Y}^{t,\omega^{m,i}}_s - \widehat{Y}^{t,\omega^{m,i}}_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega^{m,i}}}| + \sup_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega} \le s \le (\overline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega}} |\widehat{Y}^{t,\omega}_s - \widehat{Y}^{t,\omega}_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega}}| \\
&= \big|\widehat{Y}^{t,\omega^{m,i}}_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega^{m,i}}} - \widehat{Y}^{t,\omega}_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega}}\big| + 2 \sup_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega} \le s \le (\overline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega}} |\widehat{Y}^{t,\omega}_s - \widehat{Y}^{t,\omega}_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega}}| \\
&\quad + \sup_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega^{m,i}} \le s \le (\overline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega^{m,i}}} |\widehat{Y}^{t,\omega^{m,i}}_s - \widehat{Y}^{t,\omega^{m,i}}_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega^{m,i}}}| - \sup_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega} \le s \le (\overline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega}} |\widehat{Y}^{t,\omega}_s - \widehat{Y}^{t,\omega}_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega}}|.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 5.3 we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\big|\widehat{Y}^{t,\omega^{m,i}}_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega^{m,i}}} - \widehat{Y}^{t,\omega}_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega}}\big| &\le Cn\rho_2\Big(\mathbf{d}_\infty\big(((\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega^{m,i}}, \omega^{m,i} \otimes_t B^t), ((\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega}, \omega \otimes_t B^t)\big)\Big) \\
&\le Cn\rho_2\Big(\delta + \rho_n(\delta) + 2 \sup_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega} - \rho_n(\delta) \le s \le (\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega} + \rho_n(\delta)} |B^t_s - B^t_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega}}|\Big) \\
&\le Cn\rho_2\Big(\delta + \rho_n(\delta) + 2\eta_n(\delta)\Big),
\end{aligned}$$

and, similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega^{m,i}} \le s \le (\overline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega^{m,i}}} |\widehat{Y}^{t,\omega^{m,i}}_s - \widehat{Y}^{t,\omega^{m,i}}_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega^{m,i}}}| - \sup_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega} \le s \le (\overline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega}} |\widehat{Y}^{t,\omega}_s - \widehat{Y}^{t,\omega}_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega}}| \\
\le\ & \sup_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega^{m,i}} \le s \le (\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega^{m,i}} \vee (\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega}} |\widehat{Y}^{t,\omega^{m,i}}_s - \widehat{Y}^{t,\omega^{m,i}}_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega^{m,i}}}| \\
&+ \sup_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega^{m,i}} \vee (\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega} \le s \le (\overline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega^{m,i}} \wedge (\overline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega}} |\widehat{Y}^{t,\omega^{m,i}}_s - \widehat{Y}^{t,\omega}_s| + |\widehat{Y}^{t,\omega^{m,i}}_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega^{m,i}}} - \widehat{Y}^{t,\omega}_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega}}| \\
&+ \sup_{(\overline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega^{m,i}} \wedge (\overline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega} \le s \le (\overline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega^{m,i}}} |\widehat{Y}^{t,\omega^{m,i}}_s - \widehat{Y}^{t,\omega^{m,i}}_{(\overline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega^{m,i}}}| + |\widehat{Y}^{t,\omega^{m,i}}_{(\overline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega^{m,i}}} - \widehat{Y}^{t,\omega}_{(\overline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega}}| \\
\le\ & Cn\rho_2\Big(\delta + \rho_n(\delta) + 2\eta_n(\delta)\Big) + Cn\rho_1(\delta) \le Cn\rho_2\Big(\delta + \rho_n(\delta) + 2\eta_n(\delta)\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\widehat{Y}^{t,\omega^{m,i}}_{\bar{\tau}_n^{t,\omega^{m,i}}} - \widehat{Y}^{t,\omega}_{\bar{\tau}_n^{t,\omega}} \le Cn\rho_2\Big(\delta + \rho_n(\delta) + 2\eta_n(\delta)\Big) + 2 \sup_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega} \le s \le (\overline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega}} |\widehat{Y}^{t,\omega}_s - \widehat{Y}^{t,\omega}_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega}}|.$$

Plug this and (5.32) into (5.31), for $\omega \in E^{m,\delta}_i$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{Y}_t(\omega) - \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{m,\delta}_i}\Big[\widehat{Y}^{t,\omega}_{\bar{\tau}_n^{t,\omega}}\Big] &\le Cn\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{m,\delta}_i}\Big[\rho_2\Big(\delta + \rho_n(\delta) + 2\eta_n(\delta)\Big)\Big] + C\rho_n(\delta) + \varepsilon \\
&\quad + 2\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{m,\delta}_i}\Big[\sup_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega} \le s \le (\overline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega}} |\widehat{Y}^{t,\omega}_s - \widehat{Y}^{t,\omega}_{(\underline{\theta}^*_n)^{t,\omega}}| \psi^{t,\omega}_n\Big] \\
&\quad + C\mathbb{P}^{m,\delta}_i\Big[[(\Omega^*_n)^{t,\omega}]^c\Big] + C\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{m,\delta}_i}\Big[1 - \psi^{t,\omega}_n\Big] + C\mathbb{P}^{m,\delta}_i\Big[0 < d\big(\omega \otimes_t B^t, (\Omega^*_n)^c\big) < \delta\Big].
\end{aligned}$$

Then by (5.29) we have, for any $N \geq n$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[\widehat{Y}_t \mathbf{1}_E] - \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{N,\delta}}[\widehat{Y}_{t\vee\bar{\tau}_n}\mathbf{1}_E] = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{N,\delta}}\Big[[\widehat{Y}_t - \widehat{Y}_{\bar{\tau}_n}]\mathbf{1}_{E\cap\{t<\bar{\tau}_n\}}\Big] \\
\leq\ & Cn\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{N,\delta}}\Big[\rho_2\Big(\delta + \rho_n(\delta) + 2\eta_n(\delta)\Big)\Big] + C\rho_n(\delta) + \varepsilon + C\mathbb{P}^{N,\delta}\Big[[\Omega_n^*]^c\Big] + C\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{N,\delta}}\Big[1 - \psi_n\Big] \\
& + 2\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{N,\delta}}\Big[\sup_{\underline{\theta}_n^* \leq s \leq \overline{\theta}_n^*} |\widehat{Y}_s - \widehat{Y}_{\underline{\theta}_n^*}|\psi_n \mathbf{1}_E\Big] + C\mathbb{P}^{N,\delta}\Big[0 < d\big(\omega, (\Omega_n^*)^c\big) < L\delta\Big] \\
\leq\ & Cn\mathcal{E}\Big[\rho_2\Big(\delta + \rho_n(\delta) + 2\eta_n(\delta)\Big)\Big] + C\rho_n(\delta) + \varepsilon + C2^{-n} + C\mathcal{C}(\psi_n < 1) \\
& + 2\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{N,\delta}}\Big[\sup_{\underline{\theta}_n^* \leq s \leq \overline{\theta}_n^*} |\widehat{Y}_s - \widehat{Y}_{\underline{\theta}_n^*}|\psi_n \mathbf{1}_E\Big] + C\mathcal{C}\Big[0 < d\big(\omega, (\Omega_n^*)^c\big) < \delta\Big].
\end{aligned} \tag{5.33}$$

Similarly we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{N,\delta}}\Big[[\widehat{Y}_{t\vee\bar{\tau}_n} - \widehat{Y}_{t\vee\underline{\theta}_n^*}\psi_n]\mathbf{1}_E\Big] &\leq C2^{-n} + C\mathcal{C}(\psi_n < 1) + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{N,\delta}}\Big[[\widehat{Y}_{t\vee\bar{\tau}_n} - \widehat{Y}_{t\vee\underline{\theta}_n^*}]\mathbf{1}_{E\cap\Omega_n^*}\psi_n\Big] \\
&\leq C2^{-n} + C\mathcal{C}(\psi_n < 1) + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{N,\delta}}\Big[\sup_{\underline{\theta}_n^* \leq s \leq \overline{\theta}_n^*} |\widehat{Y}_s - \widehat{Y}_{\underline{\theta}_n^*}|\psi_n \mathbf{1}_E\Big]
\end{aligned}$$

This, together with (5.33), implies (5.30).

Step 3. Finally we prove the lemma for general stopping time τ. We follow the arguments in Lemma 5.11. Let τ^n be a sequence of stopping times such that $\tau^n \downarrow \tau$ and each τ^n takes only finitely many values. Applying the dominated convergence Theorem under $\mathbb{P}$:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\Big[E \cap \{\tau^n \geq \widehat{\tau}^* > \tau\}\Big] = 0.$$

Let $\delta > 0$ be a constant which will be decided later. Fix n such that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[E \cap \{\tau < \widehat{\tau}^*\} \cap \tilde{E}^c\Big] = \mathbb{P}\Big[E \cap \{\tau^n \geq \widehat{\tau}^* > \tau\}\Big] \leq \delta \quad \text{where} \quad \tilde{E} := E \cap \{\tau^n < \widehat{\tau}^*\} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tau^n}.$$

Assume τ^n takes values $\{t_i, i = 1, \cdots, m\}$, and for each i, denote $E_i := \tilde{E} \cap \{\tau^n = t_i\} \in \mathcal{F}_{t_i}$. Then $\{E_i, 1 \leq i \leq m\}$ form a partition of $\tilde{E}$. For each i, by Step 1 there exists $\mathbb{P}^i \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P}, t_i, E_i)$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[\widehat{Y}_{t_i}\mathbf{1}_{E_i}\Big] \leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^i}[\widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^*-}\mathbf{1}_{E_i}\Big] + \frac{\delta}{m}.$$

Now define $\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon := \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{P}^i \mathbf{1}_{E_i} + \mathbb{P}\mathbf{1}_{\tilde{E}^c} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P}, \tau^n, \tilde{E}) \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P}, \tau, E)$. Recall that $\tilde{E} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tau^n}$ and note that $\widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^*} \leq \widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^*-}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[\widehat{Y}_\tau \mathbf{1}_E\Big] - \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon}\Big[\widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^*-}\mathbf{1}_E\Big] \leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[\widehat{Y}_\tau \mathbf{1}_{E\cap\{\tau<\widehat{\tau}^*\}}\Big] - \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon}\Big[\widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^*-}\mathbf{1}_{E\cap\{\tau<\widehat{\tau}^*\}}\Big] \\
\leq\ & \sum_{i=1}^m \Big(\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[\widehat{Y}_{t_i}\mathbf{1}_{E_i}\Big] - \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon}\Big[\widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^*-}\mathbf{1}_{E_i}\Big]\Big) + C\mathbb{P}\Big[E \cap \{\tau < \widehat{\tau}^*\} \cap \tilde{E}^c\Big] \\
\leq\ & \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\delta}{m} + C\delta = C\delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Set $\delta := \frac{\varepsilon}{C}$, we prove the result. ■

Lemma 5.13 *Let $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$, $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, and $E \in \mathcal{F}_\tau$ such that $\tau \le \textsc{h}$ on E. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P}, \tau, E)$ such that*

$$\textsc{h} \quad \le \quad \tau + \frac{1}{L} d(\omega_\tau, O^c) + 3\varepsilon + \sup_{\tau \le t \le \tau+\varepsilon} |\omega_t - \omega_\tau|, \quad \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon\text{-}a.s.\ on\ E$$

Proof First, there exists $\tilde{\tau} \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $\tau \le \tilde{\tau} \le \tau + \varepsilon$ and $\tilde{\tau}$ takes only finitely many values $0 \le t_1 < \cdots < t_n = t_0$. Denote $E_i := E \cap \{\tilde{\tau} = t_i < \textsc{h}\}$. Then $\{E_i, 1 \le i \le n\}$ is a partition of $E \cap \{\tilde{\tau} < \textsc{h}\}$ and

$$\textsc{h} \le \tilde{\tau} \le \tau + \varepsilon \quad \text{on} \quad E \cap \{\tilde{\tau} \ge \textsc{h}\}. \tag{5.34}$$

For any i, there exists a partition $(E^i_j)_{j \ge 1}$ of E_i such that $|\omega_{t_i} - \omega'_{t_i}| \le L\varepsilon$ for any $\omega, \omega' \in E^i_j$. For each (i,j), fix an $\omega^{ij} \in E^i_j$ and a unit vector α^{ij} pointing to the direction from $\omega^{ij}_{t_i}$ to O^c. Now for any $\omega \in E^i_j$, define $\mathbb{P}^{i,j,\omega} \in \mathcal{P}_{t_i}$ as follows:

$$\beta = \mathbf{0}, \quad \alpha_t = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}[\omega^{ij}_{t_i} - \omega_{t_i}]\mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_i+\varepsilon)}(t) + L\alpha^{ij}\mathbf{1}_{[t_i+\varepsilon, T]}(t).$$

We see that

$$\textsc{h}^{t_i,\omega} = \Big[t_i + \varepsilon + \frac{1}{L} d(\omega^{ij}_{t_i}, O^c)\Big] \wedge t_0, \ \mathbb{P}^{i,j,\omega}\text{-a.s. on } E^i_j.$$

Similar to the proof of (5.11), there exists $\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P}, \tilde{\tau}, E) \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P}, \tau, E)$ such that the r.c.p.d. $\mathbb{P}^{t_i,\omega}_\varepsilon = \mathbb{P}^{i,j,\omega}$ for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in E^i_j$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \textsc{h} \quad &\le \quad \tau + 2\varepsilon + \frac{1}{L}[d(\omega_{t_i}, O^c) + L\varepsilon] \le \tau + 3\varepsilon + \frac{1}{L}\Big[d(\omega_\tau, O^c) + |\omega_\tau - \omega_{t_i}|\Big] \\ &\le \quad \tau + 3\varepsilon + \frac{1}{L}\Big[d(\omega_\tau, O^c) + \sup_{\tau \le t \le \tau+\varepsilon} |\omega_t - \omega_\tau|\Big], \quad \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon\text{-a.s. on } \ E^i_j. \end{aligned}$$

This, together with (5.34), proves the lemma. ■

Proof of Proposition 5.10. The inequality $\mathcal{E}[\widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^*}] \le \mathcal{E}[\widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^*-}]$ is a direct consequence of the $\mathcal{E}-$supermartingale property of $\widehat{Y}$ established in Theorem 5.5. As for the reverse inequality, since $\widehat{Y}$ is continuous on $[0, \textsc{h})$ and $\textsc{h}_n \uparrow \textsc{h}$ with $\textsc{h}_n < \textsc{h}$, it suffices to show that, for any $\varepsilon > 0$

$$I_n := \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[\widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^* \wedge \textsc{h}_n}] - \mathcal{E}[\widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^*}] \le 5\varepsilon \quad \text{for sufficiently large} \quad n. \tag{5.35}$$

Let $\delta > 0$, $n > \frac{1}{L\delta}$. Set $t_n := t_0 - \frac{1}{n}$, $\tau^0 := \widehat{\tau}^* \wedge \textsc{h}_n$, and $\mathbb{P}^0 := \mathbb{P}$. We proceed in two steps.

Step 1. Apply Lemma 5.11 with $\mathbb{P}^0, \tau^0, \widehat{\tau}^*$, and Ω, there exist $\mathbb{P}^{1,1} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P}^0, \tau^0, \Omega)$ and a stopping time $\tilde{\tau}^1$ taking values in $[\tau^0, \widehat{\tau}^*]$, such that

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^0}[\widehat{Y}_{\tau^0}] \leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{1,1}}\Big[\widehat{X}_{\tilde{\tau}^1}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{\tau}^1<\widehat{\tau}^*\}} + \widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^*}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{\tau}^1=\widehat{\tau}^*\}}\Big] + \varepsilon.$$

Denote $E_1 := \{\tilde{\tau}^1 < t_n\} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\tau}^1}$. By (5.3) and following the same argument as for the estimate in (4.6), we have: $\mathbb{P}^{1,1}$-a.s. on $E_1^c \cap \{\tilde{\tau}^1 < \widehat{\tau}^*\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{X}_{\tilde{\tau}^1} &\leq \widehat{X}_{\tilde{\tau}^1} - \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{1,1}}_{\tilde{\tau}^1}[\widehat{X}_{\widehat{\tau}^*}] + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{1,1}}_{\tilde{\tau}^1}[\widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^*}] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{1,1}}_{\tilde{\tau}^1}\Big[\rho_0\big(\frac{1}{n} + \|B^{\tilde{\tau}^1}\|_{\tilde{\tau}^1+\frac{1}{n}}\big)\Big] + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{1,1}}_{\tilde{\tau}^1}[\widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^*}] \leq C\bar{\rho}_0(n^{-1}) + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{1,1}}_{\tilde{\tau}^1}[\widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^*}].
\end{aligned}$$

Then we get, denoting $E_2 := E_1 \cap \{\tilde{\tau}^1 < \widehat{\tau}^*\} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\tau}_1}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^0}\Big[\widehat{Y}_{\tau^0}\Big] &\leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{1,1}}\Big[\widehat{X}_{\tilde{\tau}^1}\mathbf{1}_{E_2} + \widehat{X}_{\tilde{\tau}^1}\mathbf{1}_{E_1^c\cap\{\tilde{\tau}^1<\widehat{\tau}^*\}} + \widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^*}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{\tau}^1=\widehat{\tau}^*\}}\Big] + \varepsilon \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{1,1}}\Big[\widehat{X}_{\tilde{\tau}^1}\mathbf{1}_{E_2} + \widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^*}\mathbf{1}_{E_2^c}\Big] + C\bar{\rho}_0(n^{-1})\mathbb{P}^0[E_1^c] + \varepsilon. \qquad (5.36)
\end{aligned}$$

Next, set $\tilde{\delta} := [\delta^2\bar{\rho}_0(3\delta)] \wedge \frac{\delta}{3}$. Apply Lemma 5.13 on $\mathbb{P}^{1,1}$, $\tilde{\tau}^1$, E_2, and $\tilde{\delta}$, there exists $\mathbb{P}^{1,2} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P}^{1,1}, \tilde{\tau}^1, E_2)$ such that

$$\textsc{h} \leq \tilde{\tau}^1 + \frac{1}{L}d(\omega_{\tilde{\tau}_1}, O^c) + \delta + \|\omega_t^{\tilde{\tau}^1}\|_{\tilde{\tau}_1+\tilde{\delta}}, \quad \mathbb{P}^{1,2}\text{-a.s. on } E_2.$$

Since $\tilde{\tau}^1 \leq \widehat{\tau}^* \leq \textsc{h}$, we have

$$\widehat{\tau}^* - \tilde{\tau}^1 \leq 3\delta, \quad \mathbb{P}^{1,2}\text{-a.s. on } E_2 \cap \{d(\omega_{\tilde{\tau}^1}, O^c) \leq L\delta\} \cap \{\|\omega^{\tilde{\tau}^1}\|_{\tilde{\tau}^1+\tilde{\delta}} \leq \delta\}.$$

Then, by (5.3) and (4.6) again we have: $\mathbb{P}^{1,2}$-a.s. on $E_2 \cap \{d(\omega_{\tilde{\tau}^1}, O^c) \leq L\delta\} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\tau}_1}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{X}_{\tilde{\tau}^1} &\leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{1,2}}_{\tilde{\tau}^1}[\widehat{X}_{\widehat{\tau}^*}] + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{1,2}}_{\tilde{\tau}^1}\Big[\rho_0\Big(\mathbf{d}_\infty\big((\tilde{\tau}^1, B), (\widehat{\tau}^*, B)\big)\Big] \\
&= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{1,2}}_{\tilde{\tau}^1}[\widehat{X}_{\widehat{\tau}^*}] + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{1,2}}_{\tilde{\tau}^1}\Big[\rho_0\Big(\mathbf{d}_\infty\big((\tilde{\tau}^1, B), (\widehat{\tau}^*, B)\big)\big[\mathbf{1}_{\{\|B_t^{\tilde{\tau}^1}\|_{\tilde{\tau}_1+\tilde{\delta}}\leq\delta\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{\|B_t^{\tilde{\tau}^1}\|_{\tilde{\tau}_1+\tilde{\delta}}>\delta\}}\big]\Big] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{1,2}}_{\tilde{\tau}^1}[\widehat{X}_{\widehat{\tau}^*}] + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{1,2}}_{\tilde{\tau}^1}\Big[\rho_0\Big(3\delta + \|B^{\tilde{\tau}^1}\|_{\tilde{\tau}^1+3\delta}\Big)\Big] + C\delta^{-2}\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{1,2}}_{\tilde{\tau}^1}[\|B_t^{\tilde{\tau}^1}\|^2_{\tilde{\tau}_1+\tilde{\delta}}] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{1,2}}_{\tilde{\tau}^1}[\widehat{X}_{\widehat{\tau}^*}] + C\bar{\rho}_0(3\delta) + \frac{C\tilde{\delta}}{\delta^2} \leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{1,2}}_{\tilde{\tau}^1}[\widehat{X}_{\widehat{\tau}^*}] + C\bar{\rho}_0(3\delta).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $n^{-1} \leq L\delta \leq 3\delta$. Thus (5.36) leads to, denoting $E_3 := E_2 \cap \{d(\omega_{\tilde{\tau}^1}, O^c) > L\delta\} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\tau}_1}$,

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^0}\Big[\widehat{Y}_{\tau^0}\Big] \leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{1,2}}\Big[\widehat{X}_{\tilde{\tau}^1}\mathbf{1}_{E_3} + \widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^*}\mathbf{1}_{E_3^c}\Big] + C\bar{\rho}_0(3\delta)\mathbb{P}^{1,2}(E_3^c) + \varepsilon. \qquad (5.37)$$

Moreover, apply Lemma 5.12 with $\mathbb{P}^{1,2}, \tilde{\tau}^1$, E_3, and ε, there exists $\mathbb{P}^{1,3} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P}^{1,2}, \tilde{\tau}^1, E_3)$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{1,2}}\Big[\widehat{X}_{\tilde{\tau}^1}\mathbf{1}_{E_3}\Big] \leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{1,2}}\Big[\widehat{Y}_{\tilde{\tau}^1}\mathbf{1}_{E_3}\Big] \leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{1,3}}\Big[\widehat{Y}_{\widehat{\tau}^*-}\mathbf{1}_{E_3}\Big] + \varepsilon.$$

Define $\tau^1 := \inf\{t \geq \tilde\tau^1 : d(\omega_t, O^c) \leq \frac{1}{n}\} \wedge \widehat\tau^*$. Note that $\tau^1 < \textsc{h}$ on E_3 and $\widehat Y$ is a $\mathbb{P}^{1,3}$-supermartingale. Then

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{1,3}}\Big[\widehat Y_{\widehat\tau^*-}\mathbf{1}_{E_3}\Big] \quad\leq\quad \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{1,3}}\Big[\widehat Y_{\tau^1}\mathbf{1}_{E_3}\Big].$$

Thus

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{1,2}}\Big[\widehat X_{\tilde\tau^1}\mathbf{1}_{E_3}\Big] \quad\leq\quad \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{1,3}}\Big[\widehat Y_{\tau^1}\mathbf{1}_{E_3}\Big] + \varepsilon.$$

Plug this into (5.37), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^0}\Big[\widehat Y_{\tau^0}\Big] \quad\leq\quad \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{1,3}}\Big[\widehat Y_{\tau^1}\mathbf{1}_{E_3} + \widehat Y_{\widehat\tau^*}\mathbf{1}_{E_3^c}\Big] + C\bar\rho_0(3\delta)\mathbb{P}^{1,3}(E_3^c) + 2\varepsilon.$$

We now denote $\mathbb{P}^1 := \mathbb{P}^{1,3} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P}^0, \tau^0, \Omega)$, and

$$D_1 := E_3 \cap \{\tau^1 < \widehat\tau^*\} = \{\tilde\tau^1 < t_n \wedge \tilde\tau^*\} \cap \{d(\omega_{\tilde\tau_1}, O^c) > L\delta\} \cap \{\tau^1 < \widehat\tau^*\} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tau^1} \qquad (5.38)$$

Then

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^0}\Big[\widehat Y_{\tau^0}\Big] \quad\leq\quad \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^1}\Big[\widehat Y_{\tau^1}\mathbf{1}_{D_1} + \widehat Y_{\widehat\tau^*}\mathbf{1}_{D_1^c}\Big] + C\bar\rho_0(3\delta)\mathbb{P}^1(D_1^c) + 2\varepsilon. \qquad (5.39)$$

Step 3: Iterating the arguments of Step 1, we may define $(\tilde\tau^m, \tau^m, \mathbb{P}^m, D_m)_{m\geq 1}$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}^{m+1} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P}^m, \tau^m, D_m), \quad \tau^m \leq \tilde\tau^{m+1} \leq \widehat\tau^*;\\
&\tau^{m+1} := \inf\Big\{t \geq \tilde\tau^{m+1} : d(\omega_t, O^c) \leq \frac{1}{n}\Big\} \wedge \widehat\tau^*\\
&D_{m+1} := D_m \cap \{\tilde\tau^{m+1} < t_n \wedge \widehat\tau^*\} \cap \{d(\omega_{\tilde\tau^{m+1}}, O^c) > L\delta\} \cap \{\tau^{m+1} < \widehat\tau^*\};
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^m}\Big[\widehat Y_{\tau^m}\mathbf{1}_{D_m}\Big] \quad\leq\quad & \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{m+1}}\Big[\widehat Y_{\tau^{m+1}}\mathbf{1}_{D_{m+1}} + \widehat Y_{\widehat\tau^*}\mathbf{1}_{D_m\cap D_{m+1}^c}\Big]\\
& + C\bar\rho_0(3\delta)\mathbb{P}^{m+1}(D_m \cap D_{m+1}^c) + 2^{1-m}\varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

By induction, for any $m \geq 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^0}\Big[\widehat Y_{\tau^0}\Big] \quad&\leq\quad \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^m}\Big[\widehat Y_{\tau^m}\mathbf{1}_{D_m} + \widehat Y_{\widehat\tau^*}\mathbf{1}_{D_m^c}\Big] + C\bar\rho_0(3\delta)\mathbb{P}^m(D_m^c) + 4\varepsilon\\
&\leq\quad \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^m}[\widehat Y_{\widehat\tau^*}] + 2C_0\mathbb{P}^m[D_m] + C\bar\rho_0(3\delta) + 4\varepsilon.
\end{aligned} \qquad (5.40)$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}^m[D_m] \quad&\leq\quad \mathbb{P}^m\Big[\cap_{i=1}^m \{|B_{\tilde\tau^i} - B_{\tau^{i-1}}| \geq L\delta - \frac{1}{n}\} \cap \{|B_{\tau^i} - B_{\tilde\tau^i}| \geq L\delta - \frac{1}{n}\}\Big]\\
&\leq\quad \mathbb{P}^m\Big[\sum_{i=1}^m [|B_{\tilde\tau^i} - B_{\tau^{i-1}}|^2 + |B_{\tau^i} - B_{\tilde\tau^i}|^2] \geq 2m(L\delta - \frac{1}{n})^2\Big]\\
&\leq\quad \frac{1}{2m(L\delta - \frac{1}{n})^2}\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^m}\Big[\sum_{i=1}^m [|B_{\tilde\tau^i} - B_{\tau^{i-1}}|^2 + |B_{\tau^i} - B_{\tilde\tau^i}|^2\Big] \leq \frac{C}{2m(L\delta - \frac{1}{n})^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, (5.40) leads to

$$I_n \leq \frac{C}{2m(L\delta - \frac{1}{n})^2} + C\bar{\rho}_0(3\delta) + 4\varepsilon.$$

which implies, by sending $m \to \infty$ that

$$I_n \leq C\bar{\rho}_0(3\delta) + 4\varepsilon.$$

Hence, by choosing δ small enough such that $\bar{\rho}_0(3\delta) \leq \varepsilon$, we see that (5.35) holds true for $n > \frac{1}{L\delta}$. ∎

References

[1] Bayraktar, E., Karatzas, I. and Yao, S. (2010). *Optimal Stopping for Dynamic Convex Risk Measures*, *Illinois Journal of Mathematics*, 54 (3), 1025-1067.

[2] Crandall, M.G., Ishii, H., and Lions, P-L. (1992). *User's guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations*, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (NS)*, **27**, 1–67.

[3] Denis, L., Hu, M. and Peng, S. (2011). *Function spaces and capacity related to a sublinear expectation: application to G-Brownian motion paths*, *Potential Analysis* 34, 2, 139-161.

[4] Denis, L. and Martini, C. (2006) *A Theorectical Framework for the Pricing of Contingent Claims in the Presence of Model Uncertainty*, *Annals of Applied Probability* 16, 2, 827-852.

[5] Ekren, I., Keller, C., Touzi, N., and Zhang, J. *On Viscosity Solutions of Path Dependent PDEs*, *Annals of Probability*, to appear.

[6] Ekren, I., Touzi, N., and Zhang, J. *Viscosity Solutions of Fully Nonlinear Parabolic Path Dependent PDEs: Part I*, preprint.

[7] Ekren, I., Touzi, N., and Zhang, J. *Viscosity Solutions of Fully Nonlinear Parabolic Path Dependent PDEs: Part II*, preprint.

[8] El Karoui, N.; Kapoudjian, C.; Pardoux, E.; Peng, S. and Quenez, M. C. (1997) *Reflected solutions of backward SDE's, and related obstacle problems for PDE's.* *Ann. Probab.* 25, no. 2, 702–737.

[9] Fleming, W. and Soner, H.M. (2006) *Controlled Markov Processes and Viscosity Solutions*, 2nd ed., Springer, New York.

[10] Krylov, N.V. (1980) *Controlled Diffusion Proceses*, Springer-Verlag.

[11] E. Pardoux and S. Peng (1990) *Adapted solutions of backward stochastic differential equations*, *System and Control Letters*, **14**, 55-61.

[12] Peng, S. (2004) *Filtration consistent nonlinear expectations and evaluations of contingent claims*, *Acta Mathematicae Applicatae Sinica (English Series)*, 20, 191-214.

[13] Peng, S. (2007) *G-Brownian motion and dynamic risk measure under volatility uncertainty*, arXiv:0711.2834.

[14] Peng, S. (2010) *Backward stochastic differential equation, nonlinear expectation and their applications*, *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians*, Hyderabad, India.

[15] Soner, M., Touzi, N. and Zhang, J. (2012), *Dual Formulation of Second Order Target Problems*, *Annals of Applied Probability*, to appear.

[16] Soner, M., Touzi, N. and Zhang, J. (2012), *Wellposedness of Second Order BSDEs*, *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 153, 149-190.

[17] Song, Y. (2010) *Properties of hitting times for G-martingale*, arXiv:1001.4907v2

[18] Stroock, D.W. and Varadhan, S.R.S. (1979), *Multidimensional Diffusion Processes*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York.

[19] Zheng, W. (1985), *Tightness results for laws of diffusion processes application to stochastic mechanics*, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.*, 21(2):103-124.